JESUS

AGENTS

America . The Macmillan Company
64 & 66 Fifth Avenue, New York

Canada . The Macmillan Company of Canada, Ltd
27 Richmond Street West, Toronto.

India . . Macmillan & Company, Ltd.
Macmillan Building, Bombay
309 Bow Bazaar Street, Calcutta

JESUS

BY

ARNO NEUMANN

TRANSLATED

BY

MAURICE A. CANNEY, M.A.

WITH A PREFACE BY

PROFESSOR P. W. SCHMIEDEL

LONDON
ADAM AND CHARLES BLACK
1906

PREFACE

Messrs. A. and C. Black have asked me to contribute a Preface to the little German work which now appears in an English dress, the view of the Life of Jesus which it embodies being in all essentials identical with that maintained by myself in the articles Gospels, John, Mary, Ministry, Resurrection, Simon Peter, in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*. I accede to their request all the more readily because the author, Dr. Neumann, is an old pupil of mine and one of the ablest of them.

The idea of laying his little book before the English public seems to me a happy one, were it only because current English literature has hardly at present any work of the same type to show. So far as I can see, or can judge from the criticisms on my own articles in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, contemporary English opinion as to the Life of Jesus moves pretty much in extremes. On the one side the genuineness and historicity of the Fourth Gospel is maintained with the greatest confidence, as also the actuality of all the miracles attributed to Jesus, His birth of a virgin, His sinlessness, His bodily resurrection; on the

other, it is denied that He ever existed at all. Between such opposites is any reconciliation possible?

Nevertheless the two sides cannot permanently go on either ignoring each other, or hurling accusations, whether of levity and infidelity on the one hand, or of disloyalty to science and of a reactionary disposition on the other. The inevitable question will insist on being answered: What if the other view should after all be right? And at all costs the demand for a reply must be met. To make this effective, however, it is necessary that he who undertakes the task should not only be acquainted with the assertions of his opponents, but also that he should understand the grounds of these, and indeed the whole mode of thinking out of which it arises, and this to such an extent that he shall be able to recognise in it at least a relative justice, even if mingled with error. Proceeding on this method, the student finds himself automatically impelled to lay aside completely, in the first instance, those of his own views which diverge very widely from those of the other side, and to give prominence only to such as approximate these most nearly, with the hope that his opponent will be willing to accept them, or, failing this, that he will find himself compelled for his part to come forward in the same way, with the result that thus in the end there will come to be marked off between the two sets of widely differing views a definite area within which the decisive battle must be fought.

Such has been the course chosen by Dr. Neumann at the outset of his work. Although for his own part con-

vinced, not only of the generally historical character of Jesus, but also of the historicity of a very large number of details recorded in the Gospels, he in the first instance looks away from all this, and proceeds to consider the question of the possibility of proving to a sceptic that Jesus ever lived at all. And, with a view to such a proof, he does not call to his aid all those considerations of various kinds which have weight with himself, but only those with regard to which he can venture to hope that the other side will recognise them as at least free from objection in their scientific aspect, and at most will question whether they really are sufficient to establish the conclusion put forward. In this way he marks off the ground common to the two contending parties,—a delimitation without which there can be no prospect of a successful issue for either.

The very first steps along this path, once it has been chosen, are sufficient to show how necessary it is that it should be followed. The reason is plain; it is not because the adversary is so very obstinate, but because it is not really so simple a thing as it might seem, to supply the proof of the historical existence of Jesus in a manner that shall be wholly immune from possibility of objection.

Any sober-minded observer, who should happen to have no personal interest in either the one thesis or the other, will recognise that all doubt would most easily be laid to rest if the case were that we possessed information regarding Jesus dating from the time in which He actually lived, or shortly after it, and proceeding from people who did

not belong to the number of His adherents. Information of this kind, however, we do not possess. The notices we possess, by Jews and heathen, spoken of by Dr. Neumann (p. 3), were written some sixty to ninety years after the death of Jesus, and the oldest of them all, that of Josephus, is moreover of only doubtful genuineness; and even if they are accepted in their entirety they hardly establish more than that Christ (it is only Josephus who gives the name of Jesus) was the founder of the sect of the Christians and suffered the penalty of death at the hands of Pontius Pilate.

With Paul we are in a better position. Such impugners of the historical character of Jesus as do not, like Mr. John M. Robertson, hold the myths contained in the Gospels to be connected with the story of a Jew of the name of Jesus who was slain about a century before the Christian era, acknowledge as a rule that they would be unable to maintain their position if even only the four "principal" Epistles of Paul (Rom., 1 and 2 Cor., Gal.) were genuine. If, as Dr. Neumann and the present writer believe, it is possible to show that the genuineness of these Epistles is unassailable, and that the figure of Jesus cannot be projected back into a period earlier than the Christian era, we shall be justified in regarding the existence of Jesus as historically established. Only, by this we have gained exceedingly little for the construction of a Life of Jesus; the number of data supplied by Paul is but small.

We are thus inevitably thrown back upon the Gospels. But it must be recognised by even the most conservative

of critics that the position here is an exceedingly difficult one. There is much in them that even he himself cannot hold by, simply because it is irreconcilable with other data also given in the Gospels. Much else which he himself is not inclined to question is from the very outset so definitely declared incredible by the other side, that it would be quite useless to rely upon it for the construction of a picture of Jesus which all could accept as authentic. If the Gospels contain trustworthy material, this is nevertheless so largely mingled with what is untrustworthy, or at least questioned, that it might seem almost vain to attempt to obtain from such quarries the stones needed for an enduring fabric.

Yet let us examine a little more closely. What are the portions of the Gospels which are so persistently objected to? We find that they are, to say all in a word, those in which Jesus appears as a Divine Being whether in virtue of what He says or in virtue of what He does. And the reason why exception is taken to these passages may be stated thus: the Gospels are, all of them, the work of worshippers of Jesus, and their contents have been handed down through the channel of tradition in like manner by His worshippers; the portions to which exception is taken are open to the suspicion that they are the outcome of these feelings of devotion, and not purely objective renderings of the facts as they actually occurred. But how, let us ask, if the Gospels also contain portions which are absolutely free from any suspicion whatever of this sort? So far as the difficulty just referred to is concerned, these

at least may be historical. May be; yet it is also possible that they may not be; plainly, in fact, they cannot be if the person of Jesus is altogether unhistorical. For example: moral precepts which in themselves might justify no suspicion against the historical character of the person to whom they are attributed, could yet very easily be put into the mouth of a purely invented and in no sense historical Jesus.

Thus we find ourselves still left in the unfavourable position already indicated—unless, peradventure, we should be able to find in the Gospels some passages which, far from being equally appropriate alike to an invented and to a historical Jesus, should be wholly impossible in the former case. If Jesus is an imaginary person, the things which are, without historical foundation, ascribed to Him are entirely due to the reverence in which He was held. If, accordingly, we find in the Gospels any passages which cannot by any possibility have found their inspiration in the worshipful regard in which He was held, and which in fact are, on the contrary, incompatible with it, they in themselves prove that the Gospels contain at least something that has been rightly handed down; for if these passages had not been handed down to the Evangelists and those who preceded them in a manner that made doubt impossible, they would never have found admission into our Gospels at all.

Such was the underlying thought when in the *Encyclopædia Biblica* article Gospels, §§ 131, 139 f., I characterised nine passages in the Synoptical Gospels as "the foundation-

pillars for a truly scientific life of Jesus." I limited myself to so small a number because I desired to include no instance against the evidential value of which any objection could possibly be taken with some hope of success; and further, I, of set purpose, selected only those passages in which it is possible to show from the text of the Gospels themselves that they are incompatible with the worship in which Jesus came to be held. Thus they are, all of them, found only in one Gospel, or at most in two; the second and third, or the third, either omits the passage in question, although, by universal consent, the author who omits must have known at least one of the Gospels in which it occurs, or the source from which it was drawn; or, alternatively, he turns it round, often with great ingenuity and boldness, in such a manner that it loses the element which makes it open to exception from the point of view of a worshipper of Jesus.

It was interesting to observe the amount of interest—it must be added, of misunderstanding also—that was called forth in the critiques of the second volume of the *Encyclopædia Biblica* by what had there been said about the "foundation-pillars." The publishers have requested me to examine the points raised with some detail, and I accede to the request very willingly—not on account of any interest personal to myself merely, but because the matter, as the criticisms themselves indicate, is really of central importance, and because it is easy to understand that with the English-speaking public anything so completely new as this needs some little time before it can

secure a place alongside of the views which have been customarily heard regarding the Gospels.[1]

I have spoken of misunderstandings in this connection. To begin with the most superficial of these: No fewer than five of the eighteen English-speaking critics, whose appreciations of the second volume of the *Encyclopædia Biblica* lie before me, report me as having given but five "foundation-pillars." That is to say, they have confined their attention only to § 139, and allowed § 140 to escape them, and even in § 139 they have failed to notice the express statement that "these five passages, *along with the four which will be spoken of in* § 140, might be called the foundation-pillars for a truly scientific life of Jesus."[2]

[1] Seven of the nine "foundation-pillars" spoken of in the text are enumerated by Dr. Neumann at p. 10 below, to wit those from Mark iii. 21 to Matthew xv. 34, and severally spoken of with some detail at the places there cited. The last two (the eighth and the ninth), Mark viii. 14-21, and Matthew xi. 5 f. (=Luke vii. 22 f.), are discussed at p. 86 f. and at p. 76, note 2. In the last passage it is shown, at the same time, that also the ninth "foundation" text has undergone a transformation, with the effect of bringing it into accordance with the worship paid to Jesus, only not by Mark (for we are not in a position to say that he was acquainted with it), but by Matthew and Luke themselves.

[2] As belonging to the same class of misapprehensions, I may perhaps be allowed to add that of the article Gospels, of which the first part is by Dr. E. A. Abbott and the second by myself, one critic has attributed the whole to me, another the whole to Dr. Abbott. As regards the Fourth Gospel, one critic credits me with the view that it was written between A.D. 140 and A.D. 170, though in the article John (§§ 49*a*, 52, 60) I have given between 132 and 140 as the probable date. Again, as early as Whitsuntide 1903 one journal announced a series of articles on my article Resurrection, which were to show "what violence has to be done to attain the end" reached by me. In the first of these articles were discussed, by way of introduction, only those points in which my critic was at one with me; the remaining articles have not as yet appeared.

This, however, is but a secondary matter in comparison with the error by which I am represented as holding only five passages in all, or be it nine, in the Gospels as credible. Others of my critics, indeed, have perceived that such is not my view, and have from the outset warned against such a representation as misleading. In point of fact, not only does the entire tenor of my whole article GOSPELS show that I hold as credible many other passages in the Gospels besides the nine above enumerated, I have actually also in § 131, which prepares the way for all that follows, expressly said: "If we discover any such points—even if only a few—they guarantee not only their own contents, but also much more. For in that case one may also hold as credible all else which agrees in character with these, and is in other respects not open to suspicion."

In order to set forth my meaning more precisely, my best plan, I daresay, will be that I should devote a few words to the consideration of the one reply known to me which has some claim to thoroughness, that of Mr. Robertson in his *Pagan Christs*, pp. 227-238. In particular, he says (p. 233): "Here is Professor Schmiedel's case reduced to logical form: There are in the Gospels hundreds of unlikely sayings ascribed to Jesus; there are nine which are likely; then the nine not only establish his historic reality, but give a basis for surmise that many of the *un*likely are also historical!" This "logical form" becomes possible only on the assumption that in respect of credibility I separate the sayings of Jesus (or, to speak more correctly, the passages in the synoptics about Jesus) into

two classes only. In reality, however, I distinguish three: first, those which are plainly incredible; secondly, those which are plainly credible; and in the third category those which occupy an intermediate position as bearing on the face of them no certain mark either of incredibility or of credibility. This third group contains almost the whole of the purely religious and moral teaching of Jesus, including most of the parables; it also embraces much that is said about various journeyings of Jesus, about works of healing of the kind that are known to happen even at present, about His entry into Jerusalem, about His cleansing of the temple, about His Passion and His death.

I concede to Mr. Robertson at once that this whole class must forthwith be rejected as unhistorical, if Jesus never had any historical existence. But if He had, then it appears to me equally certain that all the statements belonging to it may be accepted as credible, provided (as stipulated in the passage already cited from § 131) that they are not open to any other objection.

Nay, more, I go farther and assert that of these statements all those which affirm something peculiarly great about Jesus, or put into His mouth some saying of marked significance, *must*, on the presuppositions we have made, be accepted as historical. For, if Jesus ever lived at all, then it was not as an obscure personality that He did so; even among His contemporaries he came to be worshipped in a degree which we see must have been intense, just in proportion as we find it leading to the accumulation upon him of honorific predicates which were not in sober reality

appropriate. This fact it is the historian's task to explain. It never for a moment occurred to me to suggest, as Mr. Robertson (p. 235) will have me do, that the nine "foundation-pillars" are sufficient for this purpose; the whole store of religious and moral teaching which the synoptists have preserved concerning Him has to be brought into requisition. He must have shown to the common people, who were groaning under the heavy yoke of the impossible demands of the Pharisees, the Father in heaven who is ready to forgive His prodigal son, whose only concern is about the disposition of the heart, and who, in full and solemn view of the coming judgment, still lays down only such precepts as a true child of God is able not only to fulfil, but to fulfil with joy. He must have been the sower, the good shepherd, the good physician. His gift as healer of the body—the limits within which this has to be taken have been already indicated—doubtless contributed to the complete result.[1]

[1] I may here venture also to correct Mr. Robertson's misapprehension of the words (GOSPELS, § 144) in which I have said: "This power [of faith-healing] is so strongly attested throughout the first and second centuries that, in view of the spiritual greatness of Jesus and the imposing character of His personality, it would be indeed difficult to deny it to Him." Mr. Robertson has supposed (p. 235) that after "this power" it was intended that the words "as an attribute of Jesus" should be supplied. In my own mind, however, the supplement I had in view was "as an attribute of various persons." In fact, immediately after the words Mr. Robertson has quoted, I go on to recount in how many instances this power is attributed to various persons in the first and second centuries. What I wished to indicate was that, in view of this fact, the same power ought not lightly to be denied to Jesus,—always supposing, of course, that He actually did live and was recognised as an important personality. If as against this Mr. Robertson urges that Paul, "ostensibly the first witness," says

One of my critics has said: "We are entitled to say . . . that there must have been in the history of Jesus that which does explain His worship—that which constituted Him Lord to His disciples, and out of which came the Gospels, the New Testament, and the Church." This is said in controversion of my view; it will, however, on examination, be plain that—in principle, at least, if not perhaps as regards the extent to which it ought to be applied to the separate portions of the Gospels which are to be accepted in this connection as trustworthy—I am entirely at one with him, as indeed appears from the immediate continuation of what I have said in the passage cited above from GOSPELS, § 131: "Indeed the thoroughly disinterested historian must recognise it as his duty to investigate the grounds for this so great reverence for himself which Jesus was able to call forth."

The third misunderstanding relates to the significance which I attach to the nine "fundamental passages." Mr. Robertson thinks I am entitled to see in them nothing more than "plausible utterances," and on this premiss finds it easy to go on to say: "If to be credited with plausible utterances be a proof of the actuality of a personage in literature, then we must believe in the historic actuality of half the characters in fiction" (p. 229). In the case of Jesus he adds (p. 234): "The credible texts

nothing of the wonder-working power of Jesus, it may be enough, perhaps, in a single word to point out that Paul, according to his own declaration (2 Cor. v. 16; 1 Cor. i. 23; Gal. iii. 1) in his oral preaching, never regarded it as part of his work to give details of the life of Jesus, and that his epistolary correspondence with the Churches which he had founded afforded him even less occasion for the imparting of such.

stand merely for the proportion of plausibility that might reasonably be looked for in any conglomerate of sayings and statements round a fictitious personage." This characterisation of the "credible texts" applies to the intermediate class of passages of which I spoke a little while ago, but not to those which I call "fundamental," and of which I have said that they are not consistent with the worship in which Jesus had come to be held. Perhaps the matter will become still clearer if I make a further citation from Mr. Robertson (p. 231): "The question is not whether something traditionally asserted to have been said or done by a demi-god *may* not actually have been said or done by a man of the same or another name, but whether, in the absence of other evidence, we are ever entitled to believe and assert that it was." If we examine for a moment Mr. Robertson's asssumption that Jesus in tradition comes before us as a demi-god only, there emerges the important distinction that Mr. Robertson is thinking of texts which, in themselves considered, are equally applicable to a demi-god and to a man, whilst my "foundation"-passages, on the other hand, are appropriate only to a man, and could never, by any possibility, have been written had the author been thinking of a demi-god. If this be true of them, then the conclusion which Mr. Robertson thinks inadmissible does in reality apply to them after all: "in the absence of other evidence" they show that the things they report as said and done are reported as concerning a man, and not invented by an author who had a demi-god before his mind.

We are thus brought to a simple question of fact: Has the distinctive peculiarity of the foundation-passages been correctly stated? Could worshippers of Jesus, such as by universal consent the writers of the Gospels were, possibly have invented for Him such words as: "Why callest thou me good? None is good, save God alone" (Mark x. 18); "Whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him, but whosoever shall speak against the Holy Spirit, it shall not be forgiven him" (Matthew xii. 32); "Of that day or that hour knoweth no one, not even the angels in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father" (Mark xiii. 32); "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" (Mark xv. 34); "No sign shall be given to this generation" (Mark viii. 12)? Or could they write regarding Him that "He could there do no mighty work" (Mark vi. 5), or that "His friends said, He is beside himself" (Mark iii. 21)? And so forth. If they were led by their worship for Jesus alone they could not. They must therefore have been led by a tradition. But, further, this tradition was itself really handed down by worshippers of Jesus; and, accordingly, these texts cannot have been invented even in this preliminary stage of Gospel-composition, but must rest upon a faithful reproduction of facts.

Mr. Robertson has not gone into the question whether this be so or not. Of the cry on the cross alone he remarks (p. 234) that "it is a quotation from the Psalms," and that "the whole cult proceeded on the doctrine that 'the Christ must needs suffer.'" On Mr. Robertson's theory of the origin of the worship of Jesus we are to take

it, then, that such an utterance might in some measure be accepted as an appropriate invention, although it still remains a strange enough thing to find this Christ, who all the while is an object of worship, declaring that He has been forsaken by God. In other theories, which also, like Mr. Robertson's, amount to a denial of the historical character of Jesus, the saying is quite inappropriate as an invention, seeing that in them suffering is not the chief business of the Messiah they imagine. The question, however, still remains why it is that of the nine foundation-texts Mr. Robertson has attempted to explain, in one way or another, but one, whereas he ought surely to have dealt with *all* of them before he could legitimately withhold from them their "fundamental" character which had been assigned to them in the article he controverts.

True, he has made yet one other attempt to show with some plausibility how they—he does not indeed specify how many of them—could have found their way into the Gospels without resting upon a correct knowledge of facts. In this attempt, it may be added, he is in agreement with one of the most conservative of my English-speaking critics. "Knowing as we do," he says (p. 234), "that the Ebionites, who attributed to Jesus unlikely sayings, nevertheless regarded him as a mere man, what does it signify if sometimes in the Gospel he is so represented?" Had, then, the Ebionites really so great an influence? According to a widely spread view, accepted also by myself (GOSPELS, § 123), Luke amongst his other sources made

use of an Ebionite one. Did he take from it any sayings of Jesus which ran counter to his worship for Jesus? No trace of this can be pointed out. Of the nine "foundation" texts Luke has only three, and none of these in a context which could have been taken from the Ebionite source in question. There is, moreover, a further question to be asked. Who were the Ebionites? When we hear them named, we think only too readily of the description of the Church Fathers, according to which they were terrible heretics. But were they not also worshippers of Jesus as well? Were they really men of such wickedness that they sought to bring the true humanity of Jesus into acceptance by falsifying the Gospels? And if they were, was it in their power to effect this falsification with so great success? There is yet one question more about them. What was the root from which they sprang? Were they in the second century really the first who started as quite new the theory that Jesus had been a mere man? Had they no predecessors in this view of His person? Must we not suppose that precisely the earliest Christians, the actual companions of Jesus—supposing Him really to have lived—were their predecessors? In such a case I can very well appropriate as my own the thesis of my two opponents, the conservative and the ultra-critical: the foundation-texts came into the Gospels through the instrumentality of the Ebionites, or rather—as I would prefer to express it—through the reports of the actual eye-witnesses of the life of Jesus.

Hardly more than a single word is necessary for the

fourth and last misunderstanding with regard to my "foundation"-texts. One of my English-speaking critics says: "The only reason given (*sic*) for the selection of these 'pillars' is the harmony of the texts with the assumptions in Professor Schmiedel's own mind." This critic has failed to observe what has not escaped the notice of another who writes of me, that "he *defends* himself against the charge that these passages have been sought out with partial intent as proofs of 'the human as against the Divine character of Jesus.'" I did in truth anticipate this charge. But for my justification here I may well content myself with pointing out that on the part of one of those who deny the historical character of Jesus, the very same charge would be warranted in the opposite sense, to the effect that the passages had been sought out with partial intent as proofs that Jesus had really lived, whereas this had not in fact really been the case. When two parties so radically opposed are both able to complain of my partiality, this partiality of mine seems to be lacking in at least one quality which usually in other case accompanies such a defect—that of one-sidedness. In reality, my foundation-texts were in no sense sought out by me for any purpose whatever; they thrust themselves upon me in virtue of one feature, and one feature only: the impossibility of their having been invented, and their consequent credibility. They will thrust themselves equally, whether he will or no, upon every other investigator who, amid the greatly-questioned mass of Gospel tradition, is looking out for something to

start with which is absolutely certain, and is accepted even by the gainsayer.

The importance of this point will perhaps be accepted as our excuse for having dwelt on it so long. For Dr. Neumann, however, as for ourselves, it is only, of course, a starting-point; and his work presents many other aspects with regard to which I consider its publication in an English edition as well timed.

In Dr. Neumann's treatment of his subject there is combined with the determined effort throughout to employ only such arguments as cannot be wholly rejected by the opposite side, a great reserve in the matter of assertion about points of detail. He makes no pretension to be able to settle everything with precision. Many things about which other scholars have contended very earnestly, and displayed an astounding amount of learning and power of combination, he is content quietly to leave undecided. To us this seems a conspicuous merit. Even in itself considered, it is of no great importance to establish what was the precise occasion on which Jesus uttered this or the other saying, or what were the dates of all the various events which we believe we may venture to regard as historical. But when we have duly marked, as we ought, to how great an extent the Gospels contradict one another in precisely such points as these, and how gravely their credibility is open to question even in much weightier matters, it appears also to be a counsel of prudence that we should become explicit only with regard to questions which, on the one hand, are of more

central importance, and on the other admit of being answered with a tolerable measure of probability. In this way our just impression of the general trustworthiness of the investigation as a whole is heightened, and this impression is what is most required if, in view of the scepticism which is penetrating into ever-widening circles, it is our wish to accomplish anything at all in the way of delineation of the life of Jesus.

Dr. Neumann has not allowed himself to be deterred by such considerations from taking a decided view on really important matters, even in certain points which in these days scholars are very ready to set aside as incapable of determination. In Germany, for example, there has in recent years been a marked increase in the number of voices which express a doubt as to whether Jesus ever at all held himself to be the Messiah, or at least whether it is possible to make out anything clearly with regard to this. Dr. Neumann, without yielding to these influences, has allowed their full rights to the texts which affirm that Jesus did in truth know himself to be the Messiah. There is, in fact, some reason to fear that the disinclination to recognise His consciousness of Messiahship does not arise from critical difficulties merely, but has to do with dogmatic considerations as well. Whilst in the period of orthodoxy the Messiahship of Jesus was regarded as a thing of absolute value, without which He could not possibly have been the Redeemer at all, the historical method has led interpreters to think that the form of the Messiah, as that was presented to Jesus through the

medium of Judaism, by no means stands upon the same level as the personality of Jesus viewed on its purely religious side. Even orthodox theology in Germany at present is very ready to refrain from attributing to Him the title of Messiah, and prefers to speak of Him only as the Son of God. Certainly a freer theology, which is fain to recognise in Jesus a universal human ideal, finds itself repelled by the one-sided Jewish conception of a Messiah.

More particularly, it is the expectation of His speedy return upon the clouds of heaven that many modern theologians are reluctant to ascribe to Jesus. Here also Dr. Neumann has given the texts their rights in the widest sense, and taken no part in the attempt of a "mediating" theology so to interpret these prophecies as if Jesus had merely predicted the coming of the Kingdom of God, and that it was only His disciples who erroneously so interpreted and modified His utterances as to make them relate to himself personally. Here also Dr. Neumann has not seen any danger lest the true greatness of Jesus should be obscured, should that be recognised as true which the literal sense of Scripture requires, that Jesus was not free from participation in the erroneous conceptions of His time.

There is one other point in which Dr. Neumann has not associated himself with the particular form of eschatological thought which is so largely represented in Germany at the present day. Proceeding on the indubitably correct observation that Jesus regarded the end of the world as quite near, it is often taken for granted that this thought

was a regulative one in all His utterances, and gave them a one-sided character which made them no longer capable of practical application to our present, with its outlook upon an illimitable future of fruitful activities for the human race. Dr. Neumann has perceived—rightly as it seems to us—that this is true only in a limited degree, and that Jesus would have given to most of His religious and moral teachings substantially the form in which they now run in the Gospels even had He never had any thought of the end of the world. This is the side of the activity of Jesus, accordingly, in which he discerns with greatest clearness His enduring importance for every age.

Upon one question Dr. Neumann has not entered,—the question, namely, whether the Fourth Gospel ought to be used as a source for the life of Jesus, and in that case preferred before the three others as being the work of an eye-witness. The limits of his book imperatively forbade the discussion of this question; his own decision on the matter is uncompromisingly in the negative. On this score he will doubtless encounter much opposition among his English speaking readers. Nevertheless, for my own part I can only say that this decision arises out of a view which is making steady and uninterrupted progress. In Germany, at least, the number of theologians who regard the Fourth Gospel as the work of an eye-witness is distinctly a dwindling one; and even those who seek to maintain that it is make so many concessions in doing so —think of the Apostle's recollection of the occurrences in

which he had had a share as having so failed, and of the theological views which he had not acquired until after the death of Jesus as having so profoundly influenced his manner of looking at what he had to say—that the (historically) credible in his narrative is seen more and more to be outweighed by that which is not so. Indeed the opinion makes some way that only the earliest basis of the Fourth Gospel was written by the Apostle John, or committed to writing in accordance with oral communications of his, and that all the rest comes from an editor whose understanding on none of the hypotheses offered appears in any very favourable light. That I should here even so much as indicate Dr. Neumann's reasons for the attitude he takes towards the Fourth Gospel is doubly superfluous, seeing that I am able to refer not only to what I have written in the article JOHN in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, but also to the same views as I have further developed them in Schiele's *Religionsgeschichtliche Volksbücher* (Johannesschriften des N.T.: I. Das Vierte Evangelium gegenüber den drei Ersten; II. Evangelium, Briefe und Offenbarung des Johannes nach ihrer Entstehung und Bedeutung).

The cautious reserve in dealing with questions of subordinate importance which we have just been speaking of as shown by Dr. Neumann, has not had the effect which might have been feared of discharging all colour from the picture he has presented of the life of Jesus. On the contrary, he has followed with much loving care those minute touches of portraiture which the Evangelists have,

without any particular object in view, introduced into their books. By these he is enabled to lead us to the well and hill of Nazareth, and, not indeed to show us in concrete detail things which actually happened there, but yet to help us to form a vivid conception of how we might think of the nature and life of the men in whose midst Jesus grew up.

He has also traced with much care all the influences of a more spiritual kind which contributed to the moulding of the character and thoughts of Jesus, while at the same time never forgetting that in the depths of His being there lay hidden a something which could never by any possibility be traced to any or all of these surroundings. Dr. Neumann, moreover, has not attempted to evade the most difficult task of all, that of tracing a development in the thoughts of Jesus which took place during the course of the public ministry itself.

While thus, as we have seen, the human element in Jesus comes to its full rights, we should yet err greatly were we to suppose that in this little book it is only the cold historian who speaks. Certainly he has always the first word, and he everywhere says frankly all that he has to say, but the deep reverence for Jesus which underlies the whole representation cannot possibly escape the notice of any candid reader. And what seems to me the best of it all is that the strict historical examination and warm reverence never disturb one another or shun one another, but the second grows and thrives upon the basis of the first. I cherish, therefore, the hope that Dr. Neumann's

little book will meet with a sympathetic response on the part of those even to whom the manner of it is new; nay, more, that even those who believe themselves constrained to gainsay it at almost every point will at least not refuse to recognise it as a serious, scientifically competent and instructive attempt to come one step nearer to the great secret which we adoringly contemplate as we behold the person of Jesus.

PAUL W. SCHMIEDEL.

University, Zurich,
3*rd December* 1905.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

CHAPTER II

CHAPTER III

CHAPTER IV

CHAPTER V

CHAPTER VI

CHAPTER VII

CHAPTER VIII

CHAPTER IX

CHAPTER X

CHAPTER XI

CHAPTER XII

CHAPTER XIII

CHAPTER XIV

CHAPTER XV

CHAPTER XVI

CHAPTER XVII

CHAPTER XVIII

CHAPTER XIX

JESUS

CHAPTER I

PRELIMINARY

Did Jesus ever exist?—Imaginative constructions and the figure of Jesus—Non-Christian sources—Testimony of Paul—The Gospels—Foundations for a life of Jesus

We are told that Napoleon, on one occasion in talk with Wieland, declared that in his view Jesus Christ was a wholly imaginary person. And, however surprising it may be to many, it is a fact that ever since Napoleon's time there has been a succession of writers in Germany, Holland, England, and America, who have denied all historicity to Jesus of Nazareth, and have regarded Him simply as an ideal embodiment of the religion of Christianity which only gradually, and quite erroneously, came to be taken for a real person who had once actually lived. The origin of Christianity itself has by such writers usually been traced, with more or less display of learning, to advanced Jewish thought, or to the philosophy, humanism, or socialism of Roman imperial times.[1]

[1] This has been done quite recently by Pastor Kalthoff of Bremen. His attempt to explain Christianity, though ingenious, is too much in the style of the modern social journalist. There is really nothing new in his arguments, and it may be hoped that, like many of his predecessors, he will see fit to revise his conclusions.

In presence of such readings of history, whatever their learning, or, it may be, their arbitrariness, there is no need for agitation on our part as if we were witnessing some act of sacrilege. Our only true course will be to call in the aid of the most strenuous science we can command, with the strict impartiality and clearness of insight that are proper to it, and having heard what it has to say on the facts of the case, here also even where the most momentous question in all history is at issue, simply endeavour to render its answer as carefully as we can in the ordinary language of educated people. It will then once more, as so often before, be made plain that piety is endangered only when the well of knowledge has been but tasted, and that deeper draughts are all that is needed to avert the peril.

1. Science asks, first of all, whether at any time in all history a character so clearly outlined, so vivid, so uniquely original as that of Jesus of Nazareth has ever been merely invented. Even the heroes of legend have their historical prototypes, and those characters which are, so to speak, mere products of the laboratory, and owe their origin to what is really nothing but myth with nothing actual to rest upon, are and must ever remain fleshless and bloodless shadows. If we are to prove that the Master really existed as a historical person, we must indeed do our utmost to restore His portrait to its original aspect, remembering how very much and in how many ways it has been touched up by worshippers. We must have some figure that cannot be resolved into a pious aspiration, and this can only be one that is thoroughly human and psychologically and historically intelligible. Should we succeed in recovering such a portrait, or rather, to speak with befitting

modesty, such a sketch of the life or character of Jesus, we shall unquestionably by this positive achievement have met in the most effective manner all negations of the kind we have indicated. For criticism at its best is well-weighed affirmation, and it is an unalterable law that what is true to Nature ever finds a faithful echo in the human heart. But it is not enough to have these general considerations with us, if when we proceed to our sketch of the figure of Jesus we do not strip ourselves alike of all vain and blinding self-confidence and of all egoism and self-will. Even though we are dealing with the greatest religious genius, the evidence of His existence and nature must be drawn from the best accredited sources.

2. Have we any testimony to the historicity of Jesus which is not derived from and not influenced by Christianity? This is the second question which impartial Science puts to us. In reply, we are bound to admit frankly that here we are but poorly, very poorly off, and that Harnack is correct when he says that the information supplied by the Jewish historian Josephus (*c.* 94 A.D.), by the Roman writers Tacitus (*c.* 116 A.D.), Suetonius (*c.* 120 A.D.), and Pliny (*c.* 112 A.D.), by the Greeks Lucian (*c.* 166 A.D.) and Celsus (*c.* 180 A.D.), in so far as it has successfully stood the test of criticism, could easily be brought within the compass of one quarto page.[1] Nevertheless, this one quarto page will be found to contain this all-important fact that one Jesus or Christus,

[1] Cp. the article "Christian (Name of)" in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*; also O. Holtzmann, *Life of Jesus*, pp. 13 ff. There is no need (*pace* Haeckel [*Riddle of the Universe*; German edition only]) to pay any attention to the Jewish stories about the birth of Jesus contained in the "Origins of Jesus" (at the earliest dating only from the thirteenth century).

founder of a Jewish sect, was crucified in Judæa under the Roman procurator Pontius Pilate.[1] Thus, whatever stress may be laid on the uncertainty of these notices and the distance of the recorders from the events recorded, a "historical locus" has been found for the person Jesus, with the help, to a large extent, of a neutral source. And if we grant that the Christian ideas in men's minds were set in motion through a personal impetus, the prime mover must have been more than an obscure rebel, He must even have been a person of such importance that people were able to associate with Him a religious and moral revolution in the ideas of men, and were impelled to worship Him.

3. Again, even if we were to refuse to attach any value whatever to this extra-Biblical evidence,—which would be an audacious proceeding,—to deny the existence of Jesus in a logical and consistent way, we must entirely remove another historical figure which stands like a rock in our path, that of the Apostle Paul. Some of his Epistles were actually written between 50 and 60 A.D., but none of them can be held to be genuine unless we are to consider the historical existence of Jesus to be beyond dispute. There have, indeed, been people who have declared those Epistles of Paul, which have by others universally been regarded as genuine, to be spurious, and have drawn the obvious consequences. But as yet they have all failed—and we believe will fail—to supply evidence for such affirmation. So little indeed have they succeeded, that his chief Epistles (at least Galatians, I. and II. Corinthians, Romans), to which there are references in extra-Biblical Christian

[1] Cp. the articles "Jesus" and "Pilate" in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*.

writings even before and about 100 A.D., have in process of time come to be regarded on all hands as the really firm ground in the Gospel story, even when we admit that this abounds in questionable and unauthentic matter. St. Paul's Epistles furnish us with evidence not only of the fact of Jesus Christ's public appearance in general, of the time in which He lived, of His mental characteristics, and of His death, but also as to some of His main ideas, as to His twelve disciples, and as to the remarkable impression which He must have made.

The value of Paul's record is not impaired by the consideration that he never saw Jesus in person,[1] for we may be sure that after his conversion he did not neglect to institute eager and wistful inquiries concerning Him.[2] It certainly is to be regretted that the historical Jesus took a comparatively subordinate place in his teaching. The truth is, as can be easily understood, that in thinking of Jesus he had before him continually the figure of One who had been taken up to heaven, of One who had appeared in a vision on the way to Damascus and had converted him, the persecutor of Christians, into a believer and a preacher.

Excluding the references in Paul's Epistles and in the four Gospels, all the other historical allusions to Jesus in the New Testament are, relatively speaking, insignificant.[3]

4. We now come to the last and greatest question of

[1] 2 Cor. v. 16, for instance, is to be explained in the sense that Paul can no longer see any advantage in that personal acquaintance with Jesus which he was not privileged to share. We never say, however, as Paul does here, of a deceased person whom we have not known, "I know him no longer."

[2] Cp. 1 Cor. xi. 23; vii. 10 f.; 2 Cor. x. 1; viii. 9, etc.

[3] We need only mention those which are of chief importance

all. How are we to appraise and to use the Gospels as sources for the history of Jesus? Here at the present day it is of fundamental importance that we should recognise that the Gospel according to John stands in a distinct category. It cannot be placed earlier than the second century, and arising as it did as a protest against Judaising parties and as a defence of ideas of religion conceived in an unhistorical way, all the details in the story, as regards localities, time, and personal characteristics, have been adapted to the requirements of that Christian philosophy in which the Gospel is steeped or have been displaced through its influence. To the author of this Gospel Jesus is the "Word of God," that is to say, the second person of the Godhead, who existed before Abraham, and in fact took part in the creation of the world (i. 1-3; viii. 5, 8; xvii. 5). Holding this view, he is naturally obliged to represent the appearance of Jesus on earth as the thinly veiled manifestation of a Divine being. Thus the Jesus of John is neither baptized nor tempted, does not waver in Gethsemane, has fore-knowledge of everything,[1] prays only for the sake of the bystanders (xi. 41 f.); when hanging on the cross says, "I thirst," only in order to fulfil an Old Testament prophecy (xix. 28); calls upon His betrayer to hasten his wicked deed (xiii. 26 f.); and by a brief word, "I am he," makes 500 Roman soldiers recoil and bend the knee (xviii. 5 f.). The author's conception of the religion of

for their contents. They are Rev. xi. 8; 1 Tim. ii. 5; Eph. iv. 20; Col. ii. 6 f.; 1 Peter ii. 24; 2 Peter i. 16; Heb. ii. 17; v. 7-10; xiii. 12; Acts x. 38 f.; ii. 22. There is no need to group them according to their age, the conditions under which they originated, and their credibility.

[1] John i. 48 f; ii. 24 f.; iv. 16-18; vi. 64, 71; xi. 11-14; xiii. 11, 18.

Jesus, pervaded throughout by the spirit we have indicated, is certainly sublime enough,[1] but it is far removed from the simple, sober, naïve facts of history as we find them in the Gospels according to Mark, Matthew, and Luke.[2]

We do not, of course, mean by this to say that John's story can nowhere and never be relied on. Far from this being the case, we find at times statements in his Gospel which point us to an original element which the other writers have allowed to escape them. We may be tempted to think that John sometimes contains a separate historical tradition, but if we make any use of it at all in describing the life of Jesus, we must do so only in the last resort. We can never make the Fourth Gospel our standard; John always has to be checked by reference to the three other Evangelists.

The first three Gospels are called collectively "Synoptic," because they present a common view (synopsis) of the Life of Jesus, in spite of differences and contradictions in details. Ever since the middle of the eighteenth century New Testament critics have been occupied with the difficult problem of their mutual relationship, with the questions of age, originality, eye-witness, primitive forms, and contributory sources; and hardly any combination can be imagined which has not been suggested.[3] Yet gradually, conflicting as opinions have been, certain sure results have been reached; by degrees a measure of agreement has become more and more marked. The Gospel according to Mark, on the whole, seems to stand nearest

[1] Cp. only John iv. 21-24; xvi. 33; vi. 63; xx. 29; v. 24; xiii. 34 f.

[2] See pp. 66, 90. Cp. the article "John, Son of Zebedee" in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, §§ 17 ff., and O. Holtzmann's *Life of Jesus*, pp. 32 ff.

[3] See article "Gospels" in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, § 125.

to the historical events; next comes the Gospel according to Matthew; and, lastly, that according to Luke.[1] This is not to say by any means that Mark can be traced back directly to the record of an eye-witness, or to deny that it incorporates a mass of ideas and ideals current at a later date amongst the worshippers of Jesus. The work, for instance, had many written predecessors, and even prior to these there were oral modes of statement and types of narrative. But in the general effect it still preserves the true flavour of originality; not seldom must it be granted, as for example in the case of chapter i., that Mark has naïvely taken over the story as he found it. In addition to the Mark tradition, we have also a highly valuable and ancient tradition of sayings of the Lord, written originally in Aramaic, the mother-tongue of Jesus (p. 45), and known as the Logia—sayings which have been worked up in Matthew and Luke. These again, however, were current in different forms, and arose out of separate catenæ and fragments, as the different movements and vicissitudes in the Church left them as remains of the preaching of the Lord.

This Mark tradition and the sayings of the Lord, then, are without doubt the two chief sources on which the Gospel history is based, but, unfortunately, they were neither written down nor dictated by eye-witnesses. The fact is, rather, that throughout the three Synoptics, even though the order noted above is correct, we have something resembling a series of geological formations: everywhere we find it necessary to distinguish all sorts of superimpositions and displacements, or, to change the figure, when we come to investigate the life of Jesus we have to proceed somewhat like Schliemann when he

[1] Cp. for example p. 49.

undertook to rediscover ancient Troy: we have to work back as he did (to the city of Priam) through deposits of different ages.[1]

5. How, then, are we to proceed if we wish to take our stand on the firm ground of history? Does not this theory of geological strata, as it were, seem to make the whole foundation precarious, and open a door to all kinds of arbitrary conjecture? It would do so if we did not come upon such elements in the tradition as the worshippers of Jesus would never have preserved unless they had been handed down as facts in the story of Jesus' life, or if we were no longer able to show from the parallel accounts how worship has continually changed the old data handed down by tradition and adapted them to its own wishes. But we do find sayings and incidents of this description in one or other of the Gospels, be they few or many, and, this being so, we are entitled to draw from them general inferences as to what is credible in the life and work of Jesus. For it is impossible (here every historian will agree) for one who worships a hero to think and speak in such a way as to contradict or essentially modify his own worship. Statements which do this can be nothing more or less than survivals of the truth, precious fragments which have been covered and well-nigh hidden for ever by the deposits of later times. For this reason a scholar of our own time, Dr. Schmiedel, has called these portions of the tradition, "foundation-pillars of the life of Jesus."[2]

[1] Despite his difficulties, Schliemann succeeded in finding the remains of the city of Priam. The "stratum theory," as applied to the Gospels, means the ideas underlying the theory that of the Gospel sources, Matthew is, relatively speaking, the oldest tradition.

[2] See his article "Gospels" in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, §§ 139 ff., and his preface to the present work.

The existence of such statements is the salvation of the Synoptic Gospels, giving them a definite value as sources. The Gospels cannot be pure sagas or legends when material so intractable is enshrined in them. What passages in Mark, Matthew, and Luke can we claim to be of the kind we have indicated?

Luke ii. 52 (cp. iv. 16) says that Jesus grew in stature in a truly human way; had the writer been a worshipper of Jesus as a deity he would have presented Him to us as full-grown (pp. 13, 34, 42). Mark iii. 21 shows that Jesus' family thought Him "beside himself"—a fact which is effaced as early as Matthew xii. 23 (p. 23). Mark viii. 12 (= Luke xi. 29-32 = Matthew xvi. 1-4; xii. 38-42) cannot be understood unless Jesus attached more importance to preaching, "the sign of Jonah," than to any miracle (pp. 75 f.). Mark vi. 5 says that Jesus' power of healing depended on the faith of the sufferer, and, where this was not present, failed (p. 84). Matthew xiii. 58 already weakens this. These last two passages in Mark do not harmonise with the idea, prompted by religious worship, that Jesus was a worker of miracles. According to Mark x. 17 (= Luke xviii. 18 f.) Jesus refuses to allow the predicate "good" to be applied to himself, and refers it to God alone (p. 62). Matthew xix. 16 f. was not satisfied with this. Again, in Matthew xii. 31 f. (Luke xii. 10 and Mark iii. 28-30 have come to view the matter differently), we are still allowed to be told that Jesus thought blasphemy against himself pardonable, but not against the good Spirit of His holy cause; and in Mark xiii. 32 (otherwise in Matthew xxiv. 36), that Jesus himself does not know the hour of the last judgment, but God alone (p. 149). All this is quite in accordance with

historical truth. Once more, the reality of the Passion is echoed quite truly in Mark xv. 34 (= Matthew xxvii. 46), "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" Though Luke with noteworthy diligence has brought together three words from the cross which were quite unknown to Mark and Matthew, in this instance the despair of the "Son of God" seemed so incomprehensible that he passed it over in silence (p. 162).

All these passages are of such a nature as neither the worship of Jesus in the growing Church, nor yet the religious socialism of the masses, could ever have invented. Their number might be added to, but as the passages quoted have already supplied us with a historical basis, we can at this stage content ourselves with these eight "foundation-pillars."[1]

They prove, indeed, that the figure of Jesus was originally a truly human one, and that we can therefore speak of Him as "divine," only in the sense that divinity is possible within the limits of the human.[2] But in saying this we do not deprive Him of His truly spiritual greatness, and in no sense do we deny that He is worthy of worship. For, as already shown, none but a quite extraordinary person could have made so abiding an impression upon men. There is no escape at all from this conclusion. The moral-religious element of the Gospels, so stimulating to the mind and morals of mankind, must be traced to Jesus, even on the evidence of extra-Christian witnesses, but still more on the evidence of the unity displayed in His inspired thoughts. There is only one critical limitation

[1] Cp. further particularly pp. 86-88 on the transformation of parables into events; also p. 76.

[2] Cp. article "Gospels" in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, § 139.

that need be added: the proviso, namely, that construction must be such as will adapt itself to the adamantine restrictions of the knowledge given in our foundation-texts. In this way, as the sketch we now proceed to give will show, Science rescues the chief contents of the Synoptic Gospels for the life of Jesus. Our work is thus based upon a well-tried foundation; a further standard by which to test its soundness is that our conclusions shall not render unintelligible those conditions existing in the apostolic age of the Church which can be so clearly recognised.

Having said so much by way of introduction, we must leave our picture of the real Jesus to speak (impressively, we hope) for itself. We, too, of the present age must travail that Christ may once more regain among the Christian people His true character (Gal. iv. 19).

EARLY DAYS

(Chaps. II.–VI.)

"And Jesus increased in wisdom and stature, and in favour with God and man."—Luke ii. 52.

CHAPTER II

NAZARETH

1. *The Place.*—The name of the founder of Christianity is inseparably associated with the little provincial town of Nazareth or Nazara in Galilee, the northern district of Palestine.[1] In passages which are really historical, Jesus is consistently represented as a Galilean and Nazarene,[2]

[1] Mark i. 9; Luke iv. 16-30; ii. 51; i. 26; ii. 4, 39; Acts x. 38. The opening sections of Matthew presuppose Bethlehem in Judah as the dwelling-place of the parents of Jesus (*e.g.* ii. 1, 11, 22), but in the course of the Gospel the correct view still occasionally emerges (xxi. 11; ii. 23; iv. 13; xxvi. 71). Both Mark (vi. 4) and Matthew (xiii. 54) say "Jesus' home," where Luke (iv. 16) has "Nazareth." Matthew ii. 23 characteristically explains the use of Nazareth for Bethlehem by means of the Hebrew phrase *Netser Ishai* ("sprout of Jesse") in Isaiah xi. 1. *Netser* would suggest Nazoræan. There are traces of an historical recollection even in John, which is much later (i. 45; vi. 42, 59; vii. 41-43, 52). Cp. the articles "Nativity Narratives" and "Mary" in *Encyclopædia Biblica.*

[2] Mark i. 24; x. 47; xiv. 67, 70; xvi. 6; Luke iv. 34; xviii. 37; xxiv. 19; Acts xxvi. 9; xxii. 8; ii. 22; iii. 6; iv. 10; vi. 14; Matthew xxi. 11; xxvi. 71; iii. 13; John xviii. 5, 7; xix. 19; i. 45.

and His followers are at first known as "the sect of the Nazarenes" (Acts xxiv. 5). As the features of a landscape do not materially change from century to century, we are able to realise even at the present day that the little hill-town of Nazareth was situated in a pleasant nook. Attracted by a gentle valley-depression at the base of the Galilean highlands and its abundant supply of spring-water, men had here formed a settlement, the ancient town of Nazareth, and in those days the terraces (Luke iv. 29) of the ancient city, intersected by olive and fig-trees, palms, vines, and garden fences, were even more a feature of the place than they are in the modern *En-Nasira*. Its principal building was the Synagogue (Mark vi. 2 = Matthew xiii. 54 = Luke iv. 16), which would play as important a part in the life of the place as a modern country church.[1] There can be no question that Nazareth was no more than something between a village and a town, —such a place, in fact, as we find in all parts of the world lying apart from the great highways of traffic. The inhabitants were in correspondence with the surroundings: tillers of the soil, vinedressers, shepherds, artisans, merchants, and a few dignitaries of the Synagogue.[2]

As with Jacob's well at Shechem (John iv. 5-26), the centre of intercourse in this country town was no doubt the single spring which still flows at the present day. We all the more willingly delight to imagine ourselves listening to the conversation at the well in Nazareth, with all its important trivialities, because Jesus' parables contain so many beautiful pictures drawn from scenes of everyday

[1] See article "Synagogue" in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*.

[2] Cp. article "Nazareth" in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, and Holtzmann's *Life of Jesus*, pp. 90 ff.

humble life. Listen to the women talking about marriage and burial (Matthew xi. 16 f.), about the kneading-trough (Matthew xiii. 33 = Luke xiii. 20 f.), and about money troubles (Luke xv. 8-10); the men about tillage (Mark iv. 3-8 = Matthew xiii. 3-10, 24-30; Luke viii. 5-8; xii. 16-21; xv. 4-7, etc.), and building (Matthew vii. 24-27 = Luke vi. 47-49); about public mishaps and executions (Luke xiii. 1-6); and all at all times about the weather (Matthew xvi. 2 f.; Luke xii. 54-56). But we need not expatiate on this tempting field.

2. *Scenery.*—On climbing on the north-west side of the broad valley of Nazareth, some hundred feet above the rows of houses to the summit of the height, a magnificent view unfolds itself. Let us borrow from one of the many descriptions by those who have stood there with open eyes and sympathetic soul (that of Furrer):—"To the west one's gaze sweeps over the low mountain spurs to the Mediterranean and the bold promontory of Mount Carmel. Southward lies the broad plain of Jezreel resembling a green lake girt with mountains. On the east rises the pyramid of Tabor clothed with young trees; and at its foot, two hours' journey from Nazareth, the old caravan road winds towards Damascus. Towards the north, above the pleasant plain El-Battauf, rises the fine range of upper Galilean mountains, and, towering over them all, Hermon looking like a king enthroned on the horizon. From Hermon to the mountains of Samaria, from the blue sea to the high mountain summits of Gilead, we have a vast panorama made all the more glorious by the spell of great reminiscences."

It was not merely within the narrow bounds of the little country town of which at a later date men could still

talk slightingly and contemptuously (John i. 46), it was within sight and range of this magnificent landscape that Jesus was brought up (Luke iv. 16; ii. 51 f.).

In the New Testament records as we now have them, indeed, Jesus never in so many words praised these beauties of His birthplace. But this may simply mean, firstly, that the Gospels, ministering to the requirements of *public* interest, could only rarely give us glimpses of Jesus' intimate personal life; and, secondly, that the substance of the Gospels was first passed on from mouth to mouth, then from one written sketch to another, and was gradually shaped, modelled, formulated by the groping hands of worshippers of Jesus within the growing Christian community. Yet however this may be, we still know enough of the character of His preaching to make it impossible to doubt His poetic feeling for and sympathy with Nature.[1] At the same time we must not ignore the Semitic atmosphere, as we moderns are always so apt to do. Doubtless we must not claim that Jesus was an enthusiast for Nature and a lover of beauty such as we may meet with at the present day. What is understood by appreciation of Nature in the modern sense was unknown even in Europe until the time of the Renaissance. For Jesus it is the religious outlook that dominates everything, as we find it doing also so magnificently in the Psalms (xix., xxix., lxv., xcvi.-xcviii., civ., etc.). For the Israelite everything, as in Jacob's dream, becomes at last the ladder which leads up to God. Even the powerful pen-picture of the Jewish poet in Job xxxvii., little as it deserves to be compared with the words of Jesus born of the moment, forms no exception to this rule.

[1] Cp. Holtzmann's *Life of Jesus*, pp. 101 ff.

But even in this respect, in His love of Nature, Jesus already rises above the standard of His countrymen. In the view that He takes of Nature we shall never find multiplication of words and involution of thoughts such as we often find in the Old Testament; what He has seen is expressed with marble simplicity and naïve delicacy. He contemplates with thoughtful insight sowing and reaping, tares and thorns, mustard shrub and fruit-tree. The lilies of the field for Him are living things. He reads a lesson in the sparrow and the dove on the housetop, in the hen in the courtyard, in the voracious bird of prey, in the fox in its hole, in the ravening wolf, in the cunning serpent. The sky prophesies; wind and waves, lightning and rain speak to Him. The changes by day and throughout the seasons move Him deeply.[1] Mere art could not give their consummate form to any of the sayings in which Jesus alludes to such matters. They bear the stamp of originality. They well forth by God's grace from a poetic soul all unconscious of itself.

With these picturesque surroundings, then, Jesus *must all His life have lived* in close communion. At morning dawn and in the evening twilight on the heights of the hills round about Nazareth we can see Him absorbed in prayer. Where else, think you, would He have learned to pray in solitude upon mountain heights or to find an

[1] Mark iv. 3-8 = Matthew xiii. 3-8 = Luke viii. 5-8; Matthew xiii. 24-30 = Mark iv. 26-29; Matthew vii. 16-20 = Luke vi. 43 f.; Mark iv. 30-32 = Matthew xiii. 31 f. = Luke xiii. 18 f.; Luke xiii. 6-9; Matthew vi. 26-30 = Luke xii. 24-28; Matthew x. 29-31 = Luke xii. 6 f.; Matthew xxiii. 37 = Luke xiii. 34; Matthew xxiv. 28 = Luke xvii. 37; Matthew viii. 20 = Luke ix. 58; Matthew vii. 15; Matthew x. 16 = Luke x. 3; Matthew xvi. 2 f.; Luke xii. 54-56; Luke x. 18; Matthew xxiv. 27 = Luke xvii. 24; Matthew vii. 24-27 = Luke vi. 48 f.; Matthew ix. 37 f. = Luke x. 2.

asylum in God's temple of Nature? Habits such as these enter into a man's nature for the most part before he has reached mature manhood. Again and again our narratives show Him to us at intervals seeking opportunities of collecting His thoughts and of asking God to help and strengthen Him, when He is at a loss to know how to proceed, when the troublesome crowd wearies Him with questions and petitions, or when the burden of decision rests with crushing weight upon His soul.[1]

3. *Home.*—Modern Nazareth has small white houses built of burnt clay or rough stones derived from the mountain slopes. The cottages are mostly foursquare, having only one room, very barely furnished. Over the fireplace is a kettle; in the corners of the room are to be observed large water-jugs, a corn measure, mats, and stools. At the side of the house are courtyard and garden. The representation of household arrangements in the Gospels corresponds to these, so that we may well believe that we have in them a picture of the home of Jesus mentioned in Mark vi. 4 = Matthew xiii. 57. We seek for colours and impressions to rest our eyes upon. Our thoughts may or may not carry us quite in the right direction. But we may reasonably say this at least, that here the home of the artisan does not necessarily presuppose poverty; what it points to, rather, is a moderately humble position—that, in fact, of the average citizen of ancient Nazareth.

[1] Mark i. 35 = Luke iv. 42; Mark iii. 13 = Matthew v. i. = Luke vi. 12; Mark vi. 46 = Matthew xiv. 23 = Luke ix. 18; Mark ix. 2 = Matthew xvii. 1 = Luke ix. 28 f.; Mark ix. 9 = Matthew xvii. 9 = Luke ix. 37; Mark i. 12 = Matthew iv. 1 = Luke iv. 1; Mark i. 45 = Luke v. 16; Matthew viii. 1; xv. 29; and, in particular, Mark xiv. 32-42 = Matthew xxvi. 36-46 = Luke xxii. 39-46.

Jesus was the first-born child of Joseph, a carpenter,[1] and of his wife Mary (in Aramaic *Maryam*).[2] The household afterwards included some younger children. In all, there were at least six others; for four other sons are named besides Jesus, though not always in quite the same order: James, Joses or Joseph, Judas, and Simon. Of these, James actually assumed the leadership in the Christian Church after Jesus' death by the side of the Apostle Peter (Gal. i. 19; ii. 9, 12).[3] We are also told of sisters. These, we may well suppose, were married and living in their native place or in the neighbourhood when Jesus entered upon His public ministry.[4]

In virtue of its original position and the number of children, the family certainly had a tendency downwards towards the lower social strata than otherwise. This clearly emerges from what we read of Jesus' way of looking at things, even when these matters are not regarded through the coloured glasses of ancient or modern social opinion, or even when it is duly borne in mind that for centuries the conceptions "poor" and "God-fearing," on the one hand, "rich" and "godless," on the other, had been closely conjoined in the Jewish mind. Cp. Amos ii. 6;

[1] The precise nature of Joseph's calling is a matter of dispute, as wood was too scarce in Palestine to serve for building purposes. In any case, he was a "builder" in the general sense, rather than, as legend has it, a worker in wood. See the article "Joseph" in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, and Holtzmann, *Life of Jesus*, pp. 81, 100.

[2] Luke ii. 16, 27, 33, 41, 43, 48, 5, 7; Matthew xiii. 55; Luke iv. 22.

[3] In view of James' strictly Jewish horizon, this event was not always calculated, as we can well understand, to promote a peaceful development. Cp. the articles "James" and "Simon Peter" in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*.

[4] Mark vi. 3 = Matthew xiii. 55 f.; Mark iii. 31-35 = Matthew xii. 46-50 = Luke viii. 19-21; Acts i. 14; 1 Cor. ix. 5; also John ii. 12; vii. 3, 5.

v. 12; Isaiah xxix. 18-21; Psalm xxxvii. 11. In the New Testament, the poor-but-pious frame of mind is brought out with most emphasis in certain parts of Luke—Luke vi. 20-25; xvi. 25 f.; cp. also James i. 9; ii. 5; v. 6.

The name Jesus, an abbreviation of the Hebrew Jehoshua (Joshua), means "God's help."[1] It is rich in meaning, and we can well understand how all kinds of legends became connected with it from early times (cp. Matthew i. 21). It was in very common use with every class of Jew, from high priests downwards. When, therefore, Origen will have it that none but pure and noble persons bore the name, this is simply one evidence the more of the uncontrolled worship of Jesus in which the Fathers of the Church indulged.[2] It is the person that ennobles the name, not the name the person. We may be certain that Joseph and Mary had no secrets to hide under this name so dear to us at the present day.

In compliance with a custom, zealously cherished still, Jesus learned His father's trade, and in pursuance of it was doubtless taken to the villages and hamlets of the surrounding districts. Even nowadays, as we are told by those who know, in the East journeymen builders travel yearly from place to place until the rainy season drives them home. Jesus always has at His command metaphors drawn from such occupation.[3] That He should have been originally no more than an artisan is anything but a degradation. From what classes were the earliest Christians recruited? Was not Peter in like manner a

[1] In Germany the corresponding Christian name Gotthilf is common at the present day.

[2] On the name cp. O. Holtzmann's *Life of Jesus*, p. 81.

[3] Matthew vii. 24-27 = Luke vi. 48 f.; Mark xii. 10; xiv. 58; xv. 29 f.; Luke xiv. 28-30. Cp. also Matthew vii. 3-5 = Luke vi. 41 f.

fisherman and Paul a weaver? What account does God take of status and calling?

Joseph's descent "from the house and family of David" seems sufficiently well established by the irreproachable and early testimony of Paul (Rom. i. 3). Paul did not simply infer the fact, but received it from others, and on this point all primitive Christendom was agreed.[1] To support the statement, at a later date, the two artificial genealogies in Matthew and Luke were produced (Matthew i. 1-17; Luke iii. 23-38). The fact of their contradicting one another is already sufficient proof that they are unhistorical, and the suggestion that one gives the ancestors of Joseph, the other those of Mary, cannot be accepted as a valid defence.[2] For they both say definitely that their purpose is to give the ancestors of Joseph; and besides, Mary, the relative of the Aaronitess Elisabeth (Luke i. 36, 5), can only be thought of as being of Aaronite descent and of the tribe of Levi, not as of Davidic origin and of the tribe of Judah. But even in the original form, in which they no longer exist (having been at an early date interpolated by additions in support of the doctrine of the Virgin-birth), these genealogies were entirely artificial—in Matthew, indeed, mere experiments with the sacred number seven and with names and genealogies in the Old Testament. In their present form, by means of

[1] Rev. v. 5; xxii. 16; Acts ii. 29-31; xiii. 22 f. Cp. p. 129 on the interpretation of Psalm cx. in Mark xii. 35-37 = Matthew xxii. 41-46 = Luke xx. 41-44.

[2] There is an important and very instructive difference between them. Matthew goes back to the tribal father of the Jews, Abraham; the Gentile-Christian Luke to the tribal father of all men, Adam. Cp. the article "Genealogies" in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*.

additions (Matthew i. 16; Luke iii. 23), they have been adapted to the doctrine of the Virgin-birth (p. 49 f.). There is no need, therefore, to waste any superfluous ingenuity on a minute examination of them. From a historical standpoint, too, we must content ourselves with a very general mention of the relatives and friends of Jesus (Luke ii. 44).

We cannot at this point discuss the question of Jesus' Davidic descent (see later, pp. 27 f. and 122 f.). But it is no argument against it to ask how possibly royal blood could have found its way so far down amongst the lower strata of the people of Galilee. A very strange fate may often befall the numerous shoots and branches of a dethroned race in the course of five centuries; and that distinctive family feeling amongst the Jews, which is deemed worthy of praise even now, kept them from falling into oblivion. It is clear that at the time the Gospels were written, documentary evidence of this family tradition no longer existed. But, in all fairness, it must be allowed that even if Jesus' Davidic origin be denied, this does not detract from His worth. Here, if anywhere, is one of the minor questions in the life of Jesus.

Jesus' father seems to have died early; he does not figure at all in the later narratives of the Gospels. The silence about him cannot be due merely to the work of a later expunging hand, because it would have been even more convenient to ignore him in the earlier narratives. Even in the scene where Jesus, now twelve years old, having been left behind in Jerusalem, is discovered in the Temple, it is Mary who is represented as the speaker. And the story harmonises well with the whole situation.

The mother, full of anxiety, when she sees her child restored to her can no longer contain herself.

The more we feel unable to regard Mary as the later faith of the Church came to regard her, the more do we long to discover something of her spiritual characteristics, but as to these we have only one perfectly sure clue. This clue people at the present day, prompted by a feeling of devotion, though without the support of history, would gladly have seen removed. But they have not been able to do so, and it remains a foundation-pillar of the very first rank for this period of Jesus' life, His youth. It is the scene in Mark iii. 21, 31-35. When Jesus had come forward into the full light of publicity, and crowds of people, filled with enthusiasm, were now gathered around Him, His relatives, with His mother at their head, journeyed from Nazareth to fetch Him home, regarding Him as over-excited and out of His mind. And there is no need to disparage Jesus' connections for acting as they did. It is obvious that in a household whose members worked hard for their daily bread, a lonely thinker would soon seem to be a useless dreamer and out of place; His new revolutionary teaching would soon clash with the inherited religion, and, finally, His claim to be the Saviour of His people would appear unintelligible and absurd. But we must not forget that it was by a mother's love for her erring child that Mary was prompted to act as she did.

Jesus was deeply pained, we cannot doubt, that His mother should be thus unable to understand His higher spiritual nature. There were people who wished to carry Him away from His nobler self. That some of these should be members of His own family, and that for a time He should have been obliged to snap all the ties of family life,

was a hard blow and meant a painful struggle (Matthew iv. 4 = Deut. viii. 3): "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." The brusqueness of that other saying, "Who is my mother?" betrays the anguish of one who has become homeless upon earth (Matthew viii. 20; cp. Luke xi. 27 f.). Later, indeed, when devotion to His cause had brought Jesus to the cross, His mother seems to have been seized, like her son James, with a sense of Jesus' own spiritual power. They are found together again in the capital when the first Church of the Nazarenes was assembled (Acts i. 14). This is proof enough that this humble Galilean woman possessed both energy and talent. But the struggle between family love and the service of God was not settled until this late date.

It is to be regretted that nothing has been recorded as to the spiritual character of Jesus' father, Joseph. But such is the fact. Some think that he was an average person, a mere lay-figure in the life of Jesus; others suppose that he, better than any one else, understood his first-born son. We do not know; but in any case father and son travelled about and worked together. When we come to consider the elements that formed part of Jesus' education, we shall be able to make some important inferences concerning the mind and mood of the household (pp. 33-42).

CHAPTER III

HISTORICAL ENVIRONMENT

1. *Year of Birth.*—With simple believers it is an unquestioned fact that Jesus was born in the first year of our reckoning, and that, accordingly, the history of the world is divided into the two great periods, Before Christ and After Christ. This reckoning has been accepted by the Church ever since the sixth century. But as soon as facts are freely investigated and dates correctly weighed, this idea, sound as it may have seemed to be, is found to break down.

We naturally turn to Luke ii. 1-7 in the very first place for the year of the Master's birth. When did the great census of the governor Quirinius, of which it speaks, take place? Under the Roman Emperor Augustus, indeed, who reigned from 31 B.C. to 14 A.D.; but it was not until the year 6 or 7 A.D. when Prince Archelaus, one of the sons of Herod the Great, had been deposed, that Judæa and Samaria were incorporated in the Roman province of Syria and made subject to taxation. On this occasion a fixing of assessments and poll-taxes (census) did take place when Publius Sulpicius Quirinius was governor (Legatus) of Syria. His subordinate officer (Procurator)

in Judæa was called Coponius. Even granting the possibility that Quirinius may perhaps have held the office of governor as early as in 3-2 B.C., it remains true that he can have taken in Judæa but this one census. The Jewish historian of the period, Josephus, only knows of this one, calls it "new and unheard of," and is at pains to tell us how great a commotion it caused among the people. With this information the author of the Third Gospel himself agrees; for in the Acts of the Apostles (Acts v. 37) he speaks of the days of *the* taxing, thus knowing of only one tax-registration and its concomitants. So long as a prince reigned in dependence upon Rome, that is to say, down to the year 6, in which Archelaus was deposed by Augustus and banished to Vienne in Gaul, such interference with the self-government of Judæa would have been impossible.[1] Unless, therefore, Luke's statement is unhistorical, Jesus cannot have been born before the year 6 or 7 of our era.

But there are internal improbabilities in Luke's account itself which impair its value. No census for "the whole world" ever took place in the reign of Augustus; there were merely censuses at different times in definite portions of the empire. Moreover, statistics concerning those who possessed the Roman right of citizenship do not come into account here. Thus, at the very least, we are obliged to conclude that the recorder has here expressed himself incorrectly. But further, even had there been some such kind of taxation, no one would have been compelled to

[1] A historical reminiscence of the reign of Archelaus is made use of in Luke xix. 12, 14 f., 27, which is not mentioned in Matthew xxv. 14-30. We are told that Archelaus went in person to Rome for his crown.

make a journey to his native place, even on the further impossible assumption that every one could have traced back his or her genealogy through centuries,—a thing which even nowadays, with church-books and registers, is seen to be out of the question. If thousands on thousands of people had really been obliged to travel about in every direction, the very reverse of what was desired would have happened. For the desire was to establish a secure system of taxation, and this was only possible if people's abodes were fixed. But further, what had women to do with such a system as this? Such ideas of the fundamental principles of Roman government may well be termed more than hazy.[1] Finally, there is a conclusive argument against the reference to the taxation in any form as a means of dating the birth of Jesus. It is this, that according to Luke i. 5 and Matthew ii. 1 Jesus was born in the reign of Herod the Great. Now, the reign of the founder of the Idumean dynasty came to an end in 4 B.C., after it had lasted thirty-four years. If, therefore, the statement common to Matthew and Luke be accepted as historical (which is the more probable conclusion), Jesus must have been born at latest in the last year of Herod's reign (cp. Matthew ii. 19-23).

From this point of view it would seem as if the account of Luke were an unsuccessful attempt to meet the requirements of the prophecy in Micah (v. 1): "Thou Bethlehem Ephratah, too small to be a clan in Judah; from thee cometh one who shall be ruler in Israel, whose origin is from ancient time, from the days of old." Jesus' parents, as a matter of fact, dwelt at Nazareth, but are represented

[1] Cp. the article "Quirinius" in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, and O. Holtzmann, *Life of Jesus*, pp. 86 f.

by the Evangelist as travelling to the city of David for the purpose of being taxed. The idea is that the child ought to be born in Bethlehem, though the prophet himself required much less than this (for the passage is poetical); the hero of the future is to be descended from the house and family of David, which (1 Sam. xvi. 18 f.) had its home in Bethlehem. We have already seen how Jesus fulfilled this requirement. But He was not able to meet the further requirement made in the two Gospels of Luke and Matthew, for it has been shown that in all probability he was born at Nazareth in Galilee. It is clear that here we already have to do with later strata in the Gospel tradition. In process of time it came to be thought that Jesus could be accredited as the scion of David and leader of His people only through Bethlehem, which was the dwelling-place of Jesse, and not through Nazareth. Thus the matter came to be explained in the simpler way which we find in Matthew (ii. 1-12; cp. p. 13 n. 1), and without recourse to the census. Here again the aid of the Old Testament is invoked, though, as so often afterwards, not in the interests of historical truth (cp. John vii. 41 f.). We must confess then that, unfortunately, Luke ii. 1-7 does not help us to any certain knowledge of the year of Jesus' birth.

There is another statement in Luke which might perhaps be expected to give us some help. Luke iii. 23 tells us that Jesus made His public appearance when He was about thirty years of age. We are at once prevented, however, from drawing any definite inference from this by the vagueness of the expression "about"; the rule that a Jew could not lawfully come forward as a public teacher unless he was thirty years of age held good only as fixing

the lower limit. John viii. 57 would suggest that Jesus was nearer fifty. Now the Gospel of Luke fixes this year of Jesus', or rather of John's first public appearance (iii. 1 f.) by means of six data, and it is clear that the recorder has exercised all possible care in giving these. The three first and most important ones, too, are undoubtedly correct, though in the others there are slight inaccuracies, which, however, do not at present concern us. They point to the year 28 (29) of our era. This would be the fifteenth year of the reign of the Roman Emperor Tiberius, who succeeded Augustus in the year 14 A.D. Pontius Pilate was at the time the under-governor (Procurator) of Judæa and Samaria (26-36 [37] A.D.), while the ruler of Galilee (and Peræa) was Herod Antipas, "the fox" (Luke xiii. 31 f.), a son of Herod the Great, and another son, Philip (this also is confirmed), was ruler in the north-east district. Caiaphas was high priest, though the office was not shared with his father-in-law, Annas (John xviii. 13), who was his predecessor rather (from 6 to 15 A.D.). If we take the thirty years strictly, starting with the year 28 A.D., we arrive at the year 2 B.C. as that of the birth; this, however, does not suit.

The truth of the matter would seem to be this: If the word "about" indicates a *plus*, we can then take it as referring to the end of the reign of Herod. This interpretation is the more likely because John ii. 20 ("in forty-six years was this temple built") is based upon the same reckoning for the year of Jesus' death (cp. p. 35 f.). Thus the scales of criticism turn in favour of the year 4 or 5 B.C. as that of the birth of the greatest figure in history. But until new and decisive documents are

discovered, it is still impossible to speak with any boldness or certainty.[1]

Appeal to the irreproachable witness of Astronomy, as the great astronomer Kepler proposed, is excluded as soon as we realise that the star of the Magi (astrologers, see Matthew ii. 1-12)[2] is not historical, but only represents in a concrete way the profound idea that the heathen world worshipped the hero of the future even in His cradle. The guiding star was suggested by the speech of Balaam (Num. xxiv. 17, "a star shall arise in Jacob") or by ideas current among the heathen, and the colouring by Isaiah lx. 3, 6, 9; ix. 1; lviii. 8; xlii. 6; xlix. 6 (cp. Luke. i. 78 f.). The case of the dating of the battle of Salamis by an eclipse of the sun must not lead us astray here. The ingenious suggestions based on the calendar which have been made quite recently concerning the date of Good Friday have again proved to be no more than vain speculations.

If we are thus obliged after all to close our inquiry into the year of the Master's birth with a note of interrogation, we can in some degree, at least, console ourselves with the reflection that the general political conditions under which Jesus lived stand out clearly enough before us even if, owing to the fact that the critical faculty in Christians awoke too tardily, historical science is greatly at a loss as regards details.

2. *Day of Birth.*—After this admission, we can hardly expect to find definite historical evidence for the day of

[1] Cp. the article "Chronology," §§ 57 ff., in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*.

[2] At a later date they are converted by the Roman Catholic Church into the three holy kings, Caspar, Melchior, and Belthasar. A pattern for the story was perhaps the journey of the Magian Tiridates in 66 A.D. from Armenia to the Emperor Nero. Cp. the article "Nativity" in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, § 18, and W. Soltau, *Birth of Jesus*, p. 40.

Jesus' birth. Nothing can be concluded from the presence of the shepherds in the field, and so forth, as to the time of year, when the story embodies as it does so many legendary elements (see pp. 51 f.). We must content ourselves with what can be learned as to the determination of a definite day by the Church and as to the history of the Christmas festival. The celebration of the birthday of Jesus is not met with at all until after the beginning of the third century. Down to that time it was the day of His death that was observed, as being the birthday of the higher life. Even then the celebration is first found amongst heretical sects, and its adoption by the Church does not come until a later date, when its power had grown. The day was originally fixed as the 6th (at first also by accommodation the 10th) of January, now the feast of the Epiphany. Day of birth and day of baptism were regarded as identical, because in the baptism the "Son of God" seemed to be born. We find this usage prevailing down to the end of the fourth century, particularly in the Eastern Church. Soon, however, religious policy, having the heathen in view, dictated the separation of the Birth from the Baptism. The 25th of December is first found as a real feast-day in Rome in 354 A.D. at the earliest. Rome was ever practical, always keeping her eyes fixed upon what was calculated to make an impression on the masses. Under Bishop Liberius she took the date as a substitute for the heathen solstice festival, calculating it from the spring equinox of the old calendar (25th of March), regarded as the date of the Annunciation. In place of the birthday of the invincible Sun-god (Helios = Sol = Mithra), she put that of Jesus Christ, the sun in men's hearts (cp. Malachi iii. 20). An official command was then sent to all places to observe

the new festival. So, gradually by the year 450 A.D. the 25th of December came to be observed throughout the Church except in Armenia. Such are the facts. There is no reason why they should in the least mar for us the beautiful festival of Christmas, "the mother of the other feasts." It is not the day that is so important, but the idea—the praise and glory of the greatest among the sons of men. The birth of Jesus remains the most important event of all history.

CHAPTER IV

ORIGINAL AND DERIVED ELEMENTS

1. *General Considerations.*—At present, in estimating personalities we find two schools of thought in constant conflict,—one seeking to derive all from the "milieu," the environing circumstances, the other appealing to the mysterious secret hidden in every individual and especially in every great individual. Our best course will be that which keeps the golden mean between the two extremes. For even the man who calls into being a new "spirit of the age" (*Zeitgeist*) is himself the child of his age. In the case of Jesus, we are easily led by our reverence for Him to give undue preponderance to what we regard as the "underivable," and take refuge in its impenetrable darkness. Let us seek another course here. Let it be our first endeavour to find out from every source those things, however small, which helped in His education, and, as far as our all too scanty sources permit us to do, trace His development, by noting cause and effect and by appealing to the facts of psychology. Then—and not till then—we may decide what things remain unexplained and inexplicable. At any rate, this is the method of real Science in

every other department of research. The "milieu," made up as it is of History and of Nature in the largest sense of these words, is not empty of God: far otherwise. The greatest, and ultimately the decisive, thing is that which constitutes the true secret of personality, especially of a surpassingly great personality. For here we are in the wonderland of the soul. We stand, as it were, by an inexhaustible spring. The Divine Spirit comes in touch with the human, strengthening it. For, of course, a creative revelation will be denied only by those who think all religion a pleasing illusion. It is, and must ever be, the secret echo of the reality of God!

That Jesus had not always been what He was, that He "became" and "grew," that He did not spring, like the fully-armed Athene, from the head of Zeus, in the Greek mythology, has been laid down as a fixed and irremovable datum by primitive Christendom in that saying of the Gospel record which supplies us with the motto for the whole of the first section of this book (Luke ii. 52): "And Jesus increased in wisdom and stature, and in favour with God and man." To this we may also add Luke ii. 40 (cp. i. 80*a*) and iv. 16.

2. *Religion in the Home and amongst the People.*—We must turn our attention, again, in the first instance, to Jesus' home, birthplace, and environment—bringing them into relation with the whole religious life of the Jews of the period. Whatever the later disagreements, it is in the house of Jesus' parents, and not elsewhere, that we must seek for the soil in which His ideal of religion and morality originally grew. To what other first source are we to trace His all-mastering strength of faith in God, His shrewd discernment, His deep feeling for the invisible forces in

life, if we do not trace them to a sound and religious family life, such as has generally prevailed among the Jews even down to the present time? Jesus' application of the family terms, "father," "child," "brother," "sister," too, when speaking of and answering the great problems of life and destiny, surely points in the same direction. Nor let us quote the proverb that even in marshes are found white water-lilies, that even on rocky slopes the fern grows green. Here we have to do with a naïve, joyous, unscarred piety, such as only gradually springs up from ancient roots. This would seem to show that Jesus' parents belonged to "the quiet in the land," and, as Galileans, were little affected by the religious partizanship which so divided the Jews of the time. These circles cherished a form of piety which did not make a great show outwardly; they looked with burning zeal for the fulfilment of the promises of a Divine deliverer, and they aimed at a moral improvement in themselves as the first condition of salvation. It was these "quiet" people, as we can easily understand, who were attracted, more than others, by the Baptist. Jesus, too, was clearly influenced by them.

There was, it is true, another form of piety in Galilee—one with that constant tendency to explosion, in which the peculiar Jewish combination of politics and religion was most clearly exemplified. Precisely the census we have mentioned as occurring in the years of Jesus' childhood (cp. pp. 25-28) had brought into the field the insurgent Judas of Gamala, on the east shore of the Lake of Galilee, a Gaulanite or Galilean (Acts v. 37); and we hear also at a later date of Galilean pilgrims to the feast at Jerusalem (Luke xiii. 1 f.) rising in insurrection and being struck down by command

of Pilate (after 26 A.D.), while they were sacrificing.[1] Perhaps Barabbas also—supposing him to be historical—may have taken part in some such commotion—Barabbas who was preferred to Jesus, when one of the prisoners was to be pardoned, though his hands were stained with blood (Mark xv. 7, 15). Nor did quiet reign in Galilee even after Jesus' death.[2] Again, in the final struggle that preceded the conquest and destruction of Jerusalem by Titus (66-70 A.D.) the two most renowned leaders were the hot-blooded Galileans, John of Giscala and Simon bar Giora.

Listening to the conversation at home and abroad, Jesus would hear all that had happened in His neighbourhood. His home surroundings, however, did not by any means tend to favour any aggressive piety of this sort, as we can see from the displeasure shown later on by His family when Jesus made His public appearance (see p. 23). His mother and brethren were much afraid lest He should share the fate of Judas. And Jesus Himself from an early period, we may be sure, was laid hold of by that moral and religious form of the hopes of the Future which He afterwards found in the teaching of John the Baptist. If this had not been so, He would never have withstood that temptation to a trial of arms, which He himself afterwards set forth in a figure (Matthew iv. 8-10), when a worldly kingdom lay alluringly at His feet. We can understand this better if we imagine Him standing, rapt in thought, upon Mount Tabor in Galilee commanding a wide view of His native land. Think of it! A moral and religious reforma-

[1] See the articles "Judas" (10) and "Pilate" in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*.

[2] Between 44 and 46 A.D. we have to add the insurgent Theudas, who in Acts v. 36 is wrongly placed before Judas of Galilee. See article "Theudas" in *Encyclopædia Biblica*.

tion, and with it the kingdom of God! This became the keynote of His life as soon as His mind had grown sufficiently mature. But it is a great question at what period it was that He came to regard himself as the all-important person in this movement. We shall have to return to the problem later.

The men of action belonged to the party called "Zealots," who ultimately degenerated into real "men of the dagger" (Sicarii, cp. Acts xxi. 38).[1] The Zealots had sprung from the Pharisees, the implacable haters of Rome and the real war-party. It is not unlikely that in His earlier days one of the disciples of Jesus was in sympathy with these people, Simon the Zealot (Luke vi. 15; Acts i. 13; in Mark iii. 18, and Matthew x. 4 he is called "the Cananæan").

We must now look rather more closely and generally at the religious parties amongst the Jews of the time, in order to fix Jesus' position more precisely.

The Pharisees have already been mentioned. The name is familiar; it means, "those who are set apart," "the separatists," *i.e.* the ultra-pious. They separated themselves, however, not only from all Gentiles—this we could understand—but even from sections of their own people, their chief aim being a painfully strict attachment to the Law, of which they had gradually grown to be, as a result, worshippers and slaves. They had become a national party by about 160 B.C., and at the time of Jesus their number was estimated at over 6000. But they had formed settlements everywhere, especially in Judæa and in the capital Jerusalem. The Gospels tell us (Mark ii. 16=

[1] See the articles "Zealots" and "Assassins" in *Encyclopædia Biblica.*

Matthew ix. 11 = Luke v. 17, 30) how they approached Jesus, at first in an isolated way, in Capernaum, after His fame had begun to spread. They had developed by degrees into a kind of Jewish inquisition, and as such they formed, as rigorists usually do, the party of authority among the people (Matthew xxiii. 15). It will be remembered that Saul belonged to the party (Phil. iii. 5; Acts xxvi. 5; Gal. i. 14; Acts xxii. 3). Seeing, however, that the Pharisees were to be found everywhere, Jesus must have come in contact with them before on several occasions, and this not merely when He visited the capital at festival time. Possibly this may have happened even in the synagogue of His native place; and certainly Pharisees would be found amongst the people who thronged about John the Baptist (Matthew iii. 7).

A healthy impulse to be true to what is ancient often develops into a mechanical obstinacy. This was so amongst the Pharisees. They not only displayed a narrow-minded attachment to the letter of the Law, but they had hedged it in with a threefold wall, as it were, of interpretations, traditions, and customs, in the expectation that, if people transgressed, their offence would thus in the first instance be against these, and not against essentials, and that transgressors would pause in fear before the citadel was reached. This led, in the first place, to complete externalism and hair-splitting casuistry, and then to the formation of a special class of persons who were learned in the Law, a kind of theological jurists. To the laity, not understanding these things, only submission was possible. This explains the constant association in the Gospels of "scribes and Pharisees." The two were bound to be allies, though they were distinct officials (cp. *e.g.* Mark ii. 16). Most of the Pharisees were not

scribes, but nearly all scribes were Pharisees. So the great heads of Schools, Hillel and Gamaliel, for instance, were Pharisees. Modern Jews have always favourably contrasted them with Jesus, and it is true that many of their thoughts are very fine. But in view of such a story as the following, it is hardly necessary to discuss the relative importance of Jesus, Hillel, and Gamaliel. Some one once asked Hillel whether it was lawful to eat on the same day an egg laid on the Sabbath. Hillel answered that if the hen was a laying one it was unlawful, but in strictness not so if it was a hen intended for the table, for in the latter case the laying is not the hen's daily work. Nevertheless, even in this case people should refrain from eating the egg, because otherwise if they ate this one, they might be tempted to eat an egg laid by this kind of hen on the Sabbath (or on an equally sacred feast-day) on which it was laid, even if an equally sacred feast-day (or Sabbath) had immediately preceded. But this was absolutely unlawful, because the hen brought the egg to maturity on the first of the two holy days, and thus produced it by daily labour. This decision shows how closely woven was the net which the Pharisees, aiming at godliness and "righteousness," had woven round all the acts of everyday life. There are very many others like it, and their object was originally praiseworthy enough. In the end one could not venture so much as to move a limb, for fear of becoming unclean; hence washings without end. The day was broken up by pious observances of every description. Tithes were taken of such minute things as mint, dill, and cumin. The Sabbath observance had come to press upon men like a strait-waistcoat. The sacrificial ritual defies description. Pious gifts are

substituted for a simple moral fulfilment of duty, giving rise to a formalism in religion, which any unsophisticated mind could not but feel to be hypocrisy (Mark vii. 1-13 = Matthew xv. 1-6; Matthew xxiii. 1-37; Luke xi. 37-52). What chiefly characterises the doctrinal teaching of the Pharisees is their zealous adherence to the idea of a resurrection (Acts xxiii. 8). This is all the more remarkable because the idea is found only in the latest Old Testament books (Dan. xii. 2) and some extra-Biblical writings of the last 130 years B.C., such as the Second Book of Maccabees (vii. 9, 11, 14, 23, 29, 36; xiv. 46).[1]

Jesus was influenced by these people, we may be sure, only in so far as they had in each period helped to promote (in a general way) the spirit of religious earnestness (Matthew xxiii. 2 f.). Except in this general way Jesus could never have been in sympathy with Phariseeism; His ideas and ideals take us back rather to those of the old prophets, so free from painful scrupulosity, so intent upon a right frame of mind as the essential thing. The fact that at a later date Jesus was charged with being totally ignorant of the learning of the School makes His connection with the Pharisees particularly improbable. Had He been in sympathy with them He would unquestionably, like Paul, have shared their learning (Mark vi. 2 f. = Matthew xiii. 54-56 = Luke iv. 22).

Jesus' education was still less influenced by the Pharisees' opponents, the Sadducees. In the first place, He was a child of the people and had nothing in common with the rich priestly nobles. Indeed, amongst these haughty friends of the Romans the ancient race of David was held in slight esteem. In the second place, there prevailed in

[1] Cp. the article "Scribes and Pharisees" in *Encyclopædia Biblica.*

these circles a laxity towards the Law and a pleasure-seeking shallowness of character such as Jesus hated intensely—as much, in fact, as He did unpatriotism. He would certainly be shocked, too, by their denial of a life after death (Mark xii. 18-27 = Matthew xxii. 23-33 = Luke xx. 27-38; Acts xxiii. 8). The Sadducees were named after Zadok, who was high priest under Solomon (1 Kings ii. 35; Ezek. xl. 46). The name, therefore, has in itself nothing whatever to do with the word meaning "just," as philologists once supposed.

Another suggestion is that Jesus was perhaps an Essene or Essean. Essenes was the name borne by another religious party among the Jews. But to connect Jesus with them is impossible, if the Essenes were an order of monks. In Jesus' character there was no element of alienation from everyday life; He never wished to form an exclusive community. He went about the villages and market-places, and participated in the varied life of the multitude. We know so little about the Essenes at present that it is useless to attempt to enter into details. That they partook of the nature of a religious order is doubtful. But it seems to be certain that in general they lived a kind of communal life in localities of their own on the Dead Sea. There are, no doubt, points of agreement with them in some of Jesus' ideas. But as with the Pharisees the spirit of the age and the political situation sufficiently explain this. All religious growths of the kind were produced, not in the hothouse, but in the open air and soil of Palestine.

Thus we come back to our starting-point. Jesus' first religious impressions were gained, not from a party, but in the quiet life of a good, simple, law-abiding, and

patriotic family, in the small and remote town Nazareth. It was a religion, not of anxious formalism or of cramped monastic discipline, but of natural warm-heartedness and sincerity. Many of the ideas mentioned in our first chapter may be explained as due to His soul-stirring meditations in the open air. We must never lose sight of the fact that Jesus did not grow up in Jerusalem, a great city where parties clashed against one another, and religion was wholly forced into moulds and bound up with etiquettes—not here, but in the simple life in which a rich and inquiring mind cannot help turning to Nature and to the eternal words preached by heaven and earth.

3. *Education.*—But no human child matures without training. The greatest of men did not grow wild. Jesus was "brought up," as we are accurately told in Luke iv. 16 (cp. p. 34). Jewish parents themselves were, in the first place, the natural and legally-appointed teachers of their children; and the first lessons were of course religious, as they are throughout the world. In other words, it was on religious subjects that all the primary activities of the mind were first exercised.

Children learned to read and to repeat from memory the books now included in the Old Testament, and more particularly the Law of Moses (the *Torah*). They familiarised themselves with all the great things which God had done since the time of the deliverance from the house of bondage in Egypt. To what extent, if any, sacred rolls were a household possession in those days we do not know. The lesson to be learned by repetition was often, doubtless, something that had been heard in the synagogue on the Sabbath and on other occasions. As soon as a child was six years old it was allowed to attend the house

of meeting. They were often helped in their lessons by the ruler and attendant of the synagogue (*Hassan*). By degrees a class of regular schoolmasters sprang up. They were to be found nearly everywhere, but if they were not present, there were, of course, scribes who were ready to expound the Law in all difficult cases. But whatever may have been the influences of all these upon Jesus' education, it is agreed that from His early years He became familiar with the wise sayings of those who had gone before Him. Flavius Josephus, the Jewish historian of the first century, whom we have already mentioned, tells us that the Jews felt they could not initiate their children too early in the service of the Law.[1] Accordingly, we do not fail to recognise that Jesus possessed an extensive acquaintance with the Old Testament, and also a ready aptitude in applying this method of proof, so important in the eyes of Jews, though at the same time it would be uncritical at this time of day to lose sight of the fact that at a later date, when Christianity had branched off from Judaism, the Church keenly felt the need of being able to regard the events in the life of the Master as fulfilments of prophecy, and to exhibit them as happy discoveries in the region of the Old Testament. Often we are able unmistakably to recognise the things which the originality of Jesus was the first to discover, to bring into conjunction, or to take as models. For Jesus read these documents in a way quite His own. With the unerring certainty of a religious genius, He picked out the central passages in every book to serve as foundations for His new structure. And, if we may believe our accounts, He preferred the Prophets and the Psalms, just as we ourselves feel that in

[1] See the article "Education" in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*.

these the pulse of piety beats strongest. Yet He knew the historical books too (Mark ii. 25 f.). The Gospels seem to suggest that the prophet Isaiah was Jesus' favourite book. He did not treat the Old Testament in the scholastic style of the Rabbis. If we want an example of their glossing and quibbling we have it sufficiently in the great Apostle Paul (*e.g.* Gal. iv. 21-31; 1 Cor. x. 1-11).

It is clear, then, that Jesus was no scholar in the sense in which the word was used in His time, but a layman. It has been appropriately remarked that He was not an academically cultured person. Had He been such, He would never have caused such astonishment as He did when He made His public appearance. Previously He had been accustomed to remain silent in the meeting-house, though any member of the community was free to come forward and speak. He had had no more than an elementary education. He must have been able to read and write, for if He had not mastered the Aramaic character He would never have been able to make an independent reading of the sacred documents to which He so often refers (Mark xii. 26; Matthew xii. 3, 5; xix. 4; xxi. 42; cp. Luke iv. 17, 20; Mark vii. 6, 10).[1] The style of the quotations also often favours the view that He knew something more than the Greek translation of the Old Testament books.

By degrees the Aramaic writing we have spoken of had come into general use among the Jews along with the Aramaic language itself from the North-East. In Jesus'

[1] Matthew v. 18 cannot be referred to here, as the passage is spurious (cp. the chapter on "the importance of the Mosaic Law"). We cannot infer anything about Jesus himself from Luke xiv. 28.

days the two were in use everywhere. The old Hebrew had become a dead language, which survived only in religious services. Aramaic is a Semitic language closely akin to Hebrew.[1] There are many traces of it in the Gospels (Mark xiv. 36; xv. 34 = Matthew xxvii. 46; Mark v. 41; vii. 34; x. 46; xv. 22). And there can be little doubt that the old collection of Sayings of the Lord, which was used and edited in the First and Third Gospels, was once written in Aramaic, even though our Evangelists had a Greek version before them. But Jesus must also have known some Greek; for towns in Galilee, especially Sepphoris in the neighbourhood of Nazareth, were pervaded with Greek elements, and Jesus, in the exercise of His calling, must often have come with His father into these parts. Ever since the time of Alexander the Great Greek had been the language of commerce throughout the world, just as French was later for a time, or as English is in some respects at the present day. But Greek everywhere assumed a colouring in harmony with the soil. Jesus was able to converse freely with the Procurator in this Jewish Greek (Mark xv. 1-6).

We cannot suppose that He had made any deep study of Greek wisdom, for there is nothing to show that He had been influenced by it. His style of thinking always gives the impression of originality and ease. We can even go further, and say that He seems to have disliked all pure speculation as such, teaching in parables and brief sayings a practical philosophy of life suited exactly to the character of the Jewish people—though at the same time possessing an idealistic force and energy which is unexampled. So that Judaism, too, points a way towards the

[1] See the article "Aramaic Language" in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*.

abstract, the general, the universal-human, however fully we may recognise the fact that it is to Hellenism that we owe the origination of the one important line of development in this direction. The fact also—so fundamental in the religion of Jesus—that it was so intimately personal in character, a mutual relation between God and each individual soul, is easily grasped when we contemplate it in the light of post-exilic Judaism. We see it anticipated in particular in the Psalms and in Jeremiah, and it is explained by the circumstances of the course of His life in an idyllic corner of the world. But in the last resort, we reach a point at which the element of the wondrous grace of God in Him meets us and compels our recognition. Thus any Greek influence to which He may have been subjected remains purely external in its character. Yet it is not unimportant to have to bear in mind that He knew three languages. For to this corresponds inevitably a widening of horizons.

In the same sense His journeys were important. The knowledge of the universe gained from books by a Kant of Königsberg is exceptional, and always savours of its source. Jesus did not, of course, make any "academic" travels (though a spurious philosophy will have it that He drew even from the Brahmans and the Buddhists)[1] in an eager search for wisdom; His travels consisted solely of pilgrimages to the festivals and of journeys occasioned by the pursuit of His calling. To these fall to be added His preaching journeys in the course of His public work. His

[1] Whether or not many parts of the Gospel, especially the story of Jesus' childhood, are related to the legends of the Buddha, is a very different question. Turkestan may, perhaps, have been the sphere of contact between Christianity and Buddhism.

wonderfully keen vision gathered new impressions everywhere. Only so can we explain such allusions as those to fortress building (Luke xiv. 28), or to the management of large estates,[1] and so forth. In the later period of His ministry Jesus does not shrink from an occasional excursion into Gentile territory. He goes to Tyre and Sidon (Mark vii. 24 = Matthew xv. 21). But most important of all is it that He came to know the Jewish capital Jerusalem, "the town of the great king," at an early date.

On this point we possess, it becomes increasingly apparent, a very valuable old record—the story of His being discovered in the Temple when He was twelve years old (Luke ii. 41-52). Its authenticity is guaranteed by this, that it contains no trace of the doctrine of a supernatural birth. It still speaks of both the parents of Jesus in a quite natural way (see *vv.* 41, 43, 48); and, moreover, they have no suspicion of His greatness. The story further supplies another of the foundation-pillars on which to build the story of Jesus' life—the saying about His growth (see *v.* 52). Such sayings could never have been invented by the worshippers of Jesus, nurtured in a later dogma regarding His person. They must have been taken over from some source as an historical heritage. The words in *v.* 49, "Wist ye not that I must be in the things of my Father," cannot be made to tell against this view, however futile may be the counter-explanations from the precocity of the boy or some peculiar disposition; we must simply concede that this answer of Jesus was formulated by a later writer. Who was there who could have made permanent record of it in that first hour in Jerusalem? In any case, the term "father" is used here in a purely

[1] Matthew xx. 1-16; Matthew xxv. 14-30 = Luke xix. 12-27.

religious sense. In short, this is an instance of an old layer of New Testament tradition preserving in its own way a historical reminiscence. In view of the general deficiency of documents it is of singular value. For, to say the least, it reveals an important element in the education of Jesus, His festival journeys, the visits to the Temple, and the instructive hours spent at the feet of the religious leaders of His people. According to Jewish ideas, at twelve years of age Jesus became "a son of the Law"; this need not have suggested the journey to Jerusalem, but it explains it as a fact. This excursion, moreover, was only the first of a series of visits which introduced Jesus to the great bustling life of the capital, though everything connected with a great town was repugnant to His soul.

Thus a tiny light has shone for a brief moment on the Master's childhood, and then once more we are plunged into deep darkness. Nor is the veil again lifted until we reach His thirtieth year. The most careful compilations, deductions, and conjectures hardly help to illuminate the intervening gulf. It is only legend that has woven its web from early time round the beginning of Jesus' life, at first, indeed, with poetic insight and feeling, but latterly with fantastic confusion. The New Testament itself contains creations of the former class. Afterwards came the Apocryphal literature, to which in its religious aspects regard is paid only by the Roman Catholic Church.

CHAPTER V

LEGENDS OF JESUS' CHILDHOOD

THE additions to the story of Jesus' childhood in Matthew and Luke, which go beyond the historical facts described in the preceding pages, must be classed as of the nature of pious legend and idealising poetry.[1] They grew up gradually amongst the worshippers of Jesus. If we look closely at the narratives, as we turn from Matthew to Luke, we can even now observe the shoots of legend growing thicker and more luxuriantly, while Mark, relatively the oldest recorder, has no legendary introduction at all. All history shows us that no hero, whether a Buddha or a Plato, or a Pythagoras, or of whatever name, has escaped adornment of this kind. This conviction is coming to be shared more and more by all thoughtful persons, and if we view tradition critically, refusing to allow our vision to be blurred, we here gain irrefragable results.

1. *The Virgin-birth.*—The origin of the doctrine that Jesus was born without a human father may be seen in Isaiah vii. 14: "Behold, a young woman shall conceive

[1] This conclusion was already implied, though not expressed, in our remarks about the Christmas festival on p. 31 f., and about Bethlehem on p. 13 ff.

and bear a son and call him God-with-us." The Greek translation of the Old Testament (the "Septuagint") wrongly gave "virgin" in this passage instead of "young woman." Matthew (i. 23) accepted this rendering, as others also did. But apart from the fact that the idea is thus changed, Isaiah's words can only relate to his own time; they can have no reference to Jesus. The whole doctrine is refuted by the fact that Jesus himself, His family, the Apostle Paul, the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the Gospel of John at a later date, know absolutely nothing about it.[1] It must have arisen amongst Christians of Gentile origin who were otherwise familiar with cases in which sons had been born of virgins. The idea is that Divine paternity establishes the rank and majesty of Jesus. If He was to be regarded as a messenger of God, the age which developed this doctrine required that He should appear as the Son of God. But the New Testament contains yet another doctrine—that of His pre-existence with God before His earthly birth; this is another concurrent attempt to establish the dignity of Jesus. The Fourth Gospel, and especially its prologue (John i. 1-18), must be regarded as the principal exponent of the doctrine of the pre-existence.

2. *Further Embellishment.*—The entire legendary structure was provided with a portico, so to say, in the stories of all sorts of miraculous events as occurring at the birth of Jesus' forerunner, John. These events are known only to the author of the Third Gospel (Luke i. 5-25, 36-37,

[1] In addition to the passages for the paternity of Joseph given on pp. 18-24 cp. also Matthew xii. 28; Mark iii. 33 f.; xii. 35-37; Mark iii. 21; Rom. i. 3; Gal. iv. 4; Rom. viii. 3; Heb. vii. 14; John i. 13.

39-45, 57-80). The Old Testament patterns for this are Abraham and Sarah (Gen. xviii. 9-15). The child that is to be born, however, is destined to be a Nazirite—one who, like Samson, shall taste neither wine nor strong drink (Judges xiii. 1-24; cp. Luke i. 15*b*). The child John already pays homage to Jesus even in His mother's womb.

As was only fitting, the coming of Jesus himself was first proclaimed by the voices of angels.[1] While, however, Matthew i. 18-21 tells us that Joseph is informed in a vision merely of his wife's high calling, Luke i. 26-38 says that the archangel Gabriel came to Mary at Nazareth in the full light of day. We have already alluded (pp. 27 f., 13 f.) to the scene of the birth in Bethlehem and to the census of Quirinius (pp. 25-27). We are told that the child's first resting-place was in a manger (Luke ii. 7); this, in substance, fits in with that genuine and historical saying of His (Matthew viii. 20 = Luke ix. 58): "The foxes have holes, and the birds of the heaven nests, but the son of man has not where to lay his head." The words are intended to convey the idea of His poverty.[2] The shepherds (Luke ii. 8-20) are, perhaps, to be connected in some way with the Tower of the flocks (Migdal-eder, Gen. xxxv. 21) in Bethlehem; but the scenery of the empty stall would suggest them almost of itself, so that there is scarcely any need for us to refer to the similar part which they played in the cave of Mithra, the sun-god. In any case, the shepherds remind us of the idyllic times of the

[1] The Magnificat is formed from 1 Sam. ii. 1-10.

[2] For the historical circumstances cp. p. 19 f. We must avoid the mistake, so common at present, of thinking of Jesus as if He belonged to the modern proletariat class.

patriarchs and of the vocation once followed by David, the royal scion of the town of Bethlehem. Being a Jew, the child would be circumcised as a matter of course (Luke ii. 21), but the Law nowhere prescribes that children should be presented in the Temple at Jerusalem, as Jesus is said to have been (Luke ii. 22-24). Various passages in the Old Testament combined towards the formation of this legend.[1] The two aged persons, Simeon and Anna, who in the Temple announce the child's great future (Luke ii. 25-38), are symbolical figures such as we meet with again in the legend of Buddha. The name of the man means "hearing," that of the prophetess "grace." We have already seen how (p. 30) the Gentile world, led by a heavenly light, paid homage to Jesus (Matthew ii. 1-12). The travelling star of the Magi will never be explained by astronomy; poetic feeling alone will rightly account for it. The gruesome story of the murder of the infants by Herod the Great may perhaps have been suggested by the Apocalypse of John (xii. 1-5), where the dragon is depicted as lying in wait for the new-born child. But the prototype in the narrative throughout was that of Moses (Exod. i. 22); the two founders of religion appear as counterparts. The flight into Egypt can also be explained from this source. The aid of the prophet Hosea (xi. 1) was invoked without any regard being had to his real meaning; it is quite obvious that Hosea is referring to the exodus of the people of Israel from Egypt under the leadership of Moses.[2]

[1] 1 Sam. i. 24; Exod. xiii. 2, 13, 15; xxii. 28; Num. xviii. 15; iii. 46; Lev. xii. 8; v. 11.

[2] Cp. the article "Nativity" in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, and Soltau, *Birth of Jesus*.

In what we have just said we have not only separated out the mythical elements from the story of the Master's childhood, but—what is more important—we have shown how they originated. By degrees, and as occasion arose, all kinds of fantastic touches were added from the Old Testament,[1] which was universally interpreted in a Christian sense, and often strained and misunderstood. In course of time all these flowers were made into a fragrant garland which was laid over the vacant space in Jesus' life. From our early days we have all loved these flowers. They have helped to awaken our first religious emotions, and they remind us of the Christmas joy of our childhood. For this reason this chapter of historical criticism will not be read, as it has not been written, without some feeling of sadness. Let not the hands and thoughts of truth be termed rude because they tear asunder golden webs! For it ever holds good, to quote the words of the Apostle Paul (2 Cor. xiii. 8), that "we can do nothing against, but everything for, the truth."

At the same time historical truth and edifying religious thought are two distinct things. The whole range of religious ideas is set down in these legends of Jesus' childhood. We will ever continue to hold them forth and reap the benefit of them in our religious services and training. We will ever anew regard poetry as the noble ally of piety. Above all, we will steadfastly cling to the great fundamental idea, the impelling motive in the making of all these legends, the idea that there was in Jesus' character, in so far as we can rediscover it, an

[1] They have also, it is true, points of contact with the formulas used in the cultus of the Emperor.

underivable element which throws us back upon God —the great original element of religious genius. In this sense the cradle of the child, who to-day is claimed as belonging to the whole world, was overshadowed by God.

CHAPTER VI

PORTRAITS OF JESUS

When we have attempted to lift the veil from the early days of Jesus, to look closely (so far as this is now possible) into the development of His personal life, and to make His historical figure stand out clearly in all its spiritual individuality, we are filled with the desire, living as we do in an age of portraiture and photography, to have a picture of His bodily form. We would gladly see the man of Nazareth as He actually appeared when He was on the point of entering on His public life. In any truly historical sense the wish can never be fulfilled; for the Gospels do not give the slightest assistance towards any picture of Jesus as He appeared in the flesh. Christians did not attach any importance to the human form of the Master until long after the eye-witnesses of the events of His life had passed away. In fact, at quite an early date the historical figure of the Nazarene was entirely overshadowed by that of the man of heaven who had risen again and been raised on high. Moreover, the earliest Christians, who were Jews by birth like the Master himself, would not tolerate religious pictures, rejecting indeed this art in all its forms as being impious. When at length people came

to form thoughts regarding Jesus' features, they took as their guide the prophet who described (Isaiah lii. 13; liii. 12) the suffering servant of God[1] as devoid of all "form and comeliness." This continued to be the idea of Church Fathers down to the fourth century. Then people began to go to the other extreme, picturing Him, on the strength of Psalm xlv. 3 (Isaiah xxxiii. 17), as "the fairest of the sons of men." This led to the introduction and spread of sculpture and painting learned from the Greeks. As early as the time of Constantine there were many representations of Christ, and their number rapidly increased. Here again, as in the case of the Christmas festival, it was the sects who led the way. Gnostics of the second century, those who mingled philosophy with religion, possessed their pictures of Jesus, just as other schools of philosophy possessed statues of their principal teachers. They traced back, in a legendary way, of course, their knowledge of the features of Jesus to Pilate and the acts of His trial. How it was that in the Church as a whole the received type of Christ came to be developed out of these remains, unfortunately, a mystery. All that we can be certain of is that the form which the type took was not based upon historical information.

This statement would now at most be controverted by the Roman Catholic Church alone, which professes to know of three images and statues of Jesus derived from the earliest times. Luke, properly a physician (Col. iv. 14), soon came to be regarded as the painter of Jesus, and so as the patron-saint of painters. We are all familiar with the typical Christ of Art, if only from Thorwaldsen's "Christ Blessing": hair and beard long and parted,

[1] He means really the noble kernel of Israel.

classical nose, mild and gentle features. Add that inevitably He was conceived of as tall and handsome, the outward thus bearing the impress of the inward. Thus, without further ado, we reach the true source and origin of all pictures of Jesus. The wish of the heart, the current ideas of the time, the feeling of reverence, and the national character, have at all times worked together in its production as in the days when the type was created. We find the same influences at work here as in the history of the Madonna. The drapery is at one time Italian, at another German; now Dutch, now Jewish. In these days Jesus must even be delineated in workman's dress in order to appeal to modern men (Uhde). But in any case we transfer to Him our own soul, our own wishes and ideas, the impression which we have gained as we immersed ourselves in the Gospels. Thus the pictures will at all times be pictures not of the historical Jesus, but of the ideal Christ—in other words, ideal pictures.[1]

At the same time we shall in a very true, though not of course in a literal, sense have been faithful to history as long as in our portraiture we have attributed to Jesus, not merely the colouring of His age and His outlook on eternity, but also, in addition to gentleness and kindliness, a glowing manliness and vigour. Thus the painter and the sculptor, too, if they would work in modern style, must first have asked themselves what Jesus historically was.

[1] We may recall the travelling Exhibition (1897) of pictures of Christ by painters of the most diverse individuality.

THE DAY'S WORK

(Chaps. VII.-XII.)

"I must work the works of him who sent me, while it is day. The night cometh, when no one can work."—John ix. 4.

CHAPTER VII

THE CALL OF JOHN

1. *The Figure of the Baptist.*—It was through John that Jesus of Nazareth was called from the contracted circle of His own home into the wide arena of public life. As to this the Gospels are all agreed, and it is expressly said in Mark (i. 1), which is relatively the earliest of them, "this is the beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ."[1]

What, then, do we know of John when we come to gather up all the historical and trustworthy facts? We have already, in dealing with the early history of Jesus (pp. 50 ff.), cleared away the mist of legend which grew up around and adorned the youth of the Baptist. We recognised that we could not in any sense rely upon his family history. It is otherwise with our information about his work and personality. He comes before us as a prophet

[1] Cp. Matthew iii. 13=Luke iii. 21; Acts x. 37; John i. 28-34.

in the garb of an ascetic (according to Num. vi. 1-21, a Nazirite?).

After the third century B.C. the voices of the Jewish prophets gradually died away. The religion of the spoken word had more and more become a religion of books. Scribal priests had taken the place of unfettered messengers of God. For some centuries the ardent longing of a people groaning under a foreign rule gave rise (in addition to wild insurrections) to all kinds of fanciful predictions of the future, which were written down in what are known as Revelations or Apocalypses. Typical of this class of literature is the Book of Daniel, composed in the years 167-164 B.C. In such books the writers transferred all kinds of things to the picture of the future—particularly material supplied by the ideas of the prophets of old. They looked forward to the advent of a Divine kingdom, and often to the coming of a Divine hero, at times even to the arrival of a prophetic forerunner like Elijah of old. All these, and more, are fundamental ideas in the thought of the age, and we must give them proper and detailed consideration in their place.

At length the ardently longed-for proclaimer of salvation—himself the herald of a still greater future—came! And he came at the very time when, the Roman rule embracing the world, the prospect of a glorious age of freedom was less than it had ever been. For this reason he too looked longingly for the end, but at the same time with a healthy sobriety and austerity. He again came into touch with the half-forgotten spirit of Isaiah and the other splendid prophets, preaching, in words which cut as with a whip-lash people of every class, that the coming of the kingdom of God depended on moral conditions: "Have

a new mind, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." Yet the New Testament bears unanimous witness to the fact that he looked forward, not to an impersonal kingdom at the approaching day of judgment, but to a quite personal inaugurator of it, the Messiah, whom he ranked far above himself.

The man who does not prepare himself by purifying his soul is not amongst the chosen children of Abraham; he is like an unfruitful tree which is given over to the axe and the fire. As the outward sign of this change of mind, he is required to take a bath—corresponding to the Jewish washings — in flowing water. So John baptized in the Jordan, long held sacred. From Judæa and its capital, in particular, people came in crowds to the stony waste of the Jordan valley to see the Baptist.[1]

We may be sure that many of these people were drawn there by curiosity. The prophet was indeed a remarkable figure. By that time the camel-hair[2] mantle of the prophets and the leathern girdle had become unfamiliar articles of apparel. John, moreover, fasted or was satisfied with the simplest kind of food—locusts from the reeds by the river and honey from the caves. He also refused wine and the use of a razor (Matthew xi. 18 f. = Luke vii. 33 f.). Among the Jews of the time there were, of course, not a few ascetics—and these of both classes, hermits and monks

[1] Mark i. 4 f. = Matthew iii. 1-5 = Luke iii. 2 f. John i. 28 mentions Bethany on the east of Jordan—at least according to an older MS.—a place which cannot be shown in those regions; in later MSS. there is a conjecture of Origen that Bethabara, a place known to no one else, is meant. Aenon in John iii. 23 is a legendary spring to the west of Jordan.

[2] Matthew iii. 4; cp. Zech. xiii. 4; 1 Kings xi. 29 f. On the other hand, Mark i. 6 (cp. 2 Kings i. 8) and Heb. xi. 37 would suggest rather skin.

(cp. p. 41 f.). Thus there was something gloomy, harsh, and severe about the figure of John. But his asceticism was simply an accidental feature, the pledge of his calling as a forerunner.[1]

Many persons, too, were certainly attracted to him and deeply moved by his impressive words about popular reform and selection (Mark xi. 32 = Matthew xxi. 26 = Luke xx. 6; Matthew xxi. 32), especially the quiet people in the land, the petty folk with their simple piety and good morals. John's severe criticism of the Pharisees and Sadducees seems to point to this (Matthew iii. 7-12 = Luke iii. 7-17; Luke vii. 29 f.). The coming of Jesus from Nazareth (cp. p. 35) indicates the same thing, as also still more explicitly do His words (Matthew xi. 8 = Luke vii. 25).

2. *The Baptism of Jesus.*[2]—The fame of the great preacher of repentance reached the ears of Jesus whose soul—the depth and growth of which we have tried to fathom—was well prepared for a strenuous moral appeal of this kind. He came, listened, and received the baptism of repentance, going down and dipping into the Jordan in the presence of the Baptist. We learn from this incident, if we set aside all theological presuppositions, that Jesus felt a change of mind to be in the case of every individual a condition of salvation, or, in other words, of Divine happiness. And from this moment He himself desired, as He faced the future, to serve God with increased ardour and renewed strength. Not so much that the past depressed himself personally, as that the future kingdom of God was

[1] Cp. the article "John the Baptist" in *Encyclopædia Biblica.*

[2] Mark i. 9-11 = Matthew iii. 13-17 = Luke iii. 21 f.; Acts i. 22. John i. 29-34, on the other hand, will no longer hear anything of a baptism of Jesus by John.

an object of longing—this is what His action expressed (cp. p. 34 f.). Never assuredly in His case was a breach with the past necessary as it was with a Paul, an Augustine, or a Luther. His piety and purity were the natural outcome of a divinely gifted heroic soul. But this does not by any means imply a sense of sinlessness, of absolute self-contentment. A sinlessness which knew no development cannot in the least be thought of here; besides, it would not at all help us, struggling mortals as we are. How could One who had himself had no experience whatever of inward struggle be a religious leader?[1] We may say, rather, that He who was the Son of man was a stranger to no human experience whatever. Let us once more quote certain words of Jesus which a later worshipper of the Christ would never have invented—one of the sayings which, like a great search-light, reveal the historical truth in the life of Jesus: "Why callest thou me good? None is good but God" (Mark x. 17 f. = Luke xviii. 18 f.; cp. p. 10). Notwithstanding, the fact remains that there was in Jesus a moral sublimity without parallel.

In these moments of His baptism the champion for God and goodness had a mighty subjective experience, concerning which at a later date He must have spoken to His disciples. He seemed to be filled with a new Spirit from on high. There is no need whatever to suppose, if we are to define this experience more exactly, that He saw an objective vision. The fruit of these moments was perhaps simply the same as that which at a later date formed the essence of His convictions—the idea of the Father, as we find it in the words, "Thou art my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." This, of course, is not to be taken so

[1] Heb. ii. 17 f., iv. 15, already points us in the right direction.

literally as to mean that He was the first to whom thoughts of this kind had occurred, for they are found already in the Old Testament as we shall show later (p. 96 f.), if only as erratic blocks. If, as is certain, it is impossible for us to think of the boy of twelve years as the fully-matured revealer of God as Father, we may nevertheless be assured of the ceaseless groping and striving of this divinely gifted spirit in the same direction long before His thirtieth year. But it was here finally, in the neighbourhood of John, that He first became assured that God was a Father, mankind His brothers and sisters, and the earth a Father's house. This conviction became the guiding star of His life.

It is true that if we regard the story of the baptism in this way, its miraculous drapery falls away. But even Mark's account of the baptism, if we examine it closely, justifies us in dropping this element. We learn from this source that none but Jesus himself perceived the heavenly occurrences. It is *He* who sees the open heaven, and the Spirit in the form of a dove; *He* who hears the voice. The simple story of the real Jesus grew only gradually into the dogma of the Church. From Mark it develops to Matthew iii. 14 f. and Luke iii. 22; in John, of all the New Testament books, the exaggeration is greatest (John i. 1-3, 14, 18, 29-34, and iii. 25-36; v. 35; note the idea of pre-existence, and cp. p. 50). But there is no reason whatever to deny the baptism in the Jordan to be the opening of the public life of Jesus, unless we have invalidated our sources at the start by dogmatically asserting their entire untrustworthiness as history (cp. Chap. I.).

Nevertheless a miracle, albeit a refined one, is suggested when Jesus is supposed to have felt conscious of His

Messiahship at His baptism, or to have been convinced that He was the chosen inaugurator of the kingdom of God. Yet that is the view of nearly all critical theologians. It was then that, without any intermediate stage, He arrived at such a conviction as one can only arrive at by mixing among men. Thenceforward His chief task in the first instance was to hide His greatness. But on this assumption we cannot understand how His humble submission to John should have called forth so majestic a feeling. We therefore attach ourselves to the few critics who reject this explanation of the baptism, and find themselves able to understand it, in a historically and psychologically intelligible way, only as being connected with the reform movement of the Baptist, and thus as having given rise to deep and far-reaching religious and moral emotions and reflections. We must reserve for another occasion a more precise description of the manner in which at a later date Jesus became conscious that He was the Messiah.

We have thus recognised that in a certain respect Jesus was a follower of John, or perhaps even that He became a disciple. We can no longer decide to what extent He was influenced by the Baptist in details. The Gospels suggest (Matthew iii. 7-9 = Luke iii. 7-14) that even John claimed the freedom of a prophet as regards the ceremonial law. His fasting, on the other hand, was simply part of His asceticism. It is therefore not impossible that subsequently disciples of John went over to the Nazarenes;[1] in any case, the Christian practice of baptism seems to have been adopted from John. We do not know what share

[1] Cp. at any rate Mark ii. 18-20 = Matthew ix. 14-16 = Luke v. 33-35, and Acts xviii. 25; xix. 1-7. John (i. 35-42; iii. 22-26), of course, goes much too far.

Jesus himself took in the institution of it. We can only be sure of this, that at an early date the custom was traced back not only to His example, but also to His instructions.[1]

How highly Jesus thought of John we seem entitled to infer from the source for the Sayings, common to Matthew and Luke (here to be found in Matthew xi. 7-9, 11 = Luke vii. 24-26, 28). Praising the unswerving energy of the man, Jesus here calls him Israel's greatest prophet.

Unless Matthew xi. 11*b* is a later addition by some Christian who was anxious to insist upon Jesus' superiority to John, Jesus' estimation of the Baptist will date from a time when He had long come to recognise John's limitations and His own superior greatness. On another occasion Jesus referred to the unbelief which, as in His own case, had withstood the Divine authority of such a one as John (Mark xi. 27-33 = Matthew xxi. 23-27 = Luke xx. 1-8). To John, however, Jesus at His baptism was, we are to understand, simply a stranger from Galilee. It was not until he had heard, while in prison, of Jesus' mighty works that he perhaps allowed the question to be put to him, "Is this the Messiah?" Then he must have looked forward with feverish impatience to seeing the works of the Messiah (Matthew xi. 2-7 = Luke vii. 18-23).

All that does not fall in with this historical view of

[1] Mark x. 38; Acts i. 5; xi. 16; John iii. 22 f., 26 (on the other hand, iv. 2); cp. Heb. vi. 2. It is an open question whether Paul in 1 Cor. i. 13-17 (about the year 56) and Jesus' words when He sent forth the disciples (Mark vi. 8-10 = Matthew x. 5-42 = Luke ix. 2-4; xii. 11 f.) are absolutely opposed to this view. What is called the command to baptize, Matthew xxviii. 19, in its threefold form is of much later date. Originally persons were baptized only as belonging to Christ (Jesus the Messiah): Gal. iii. 27; Rom. vi. 3; Acts ii. 38; viii. 16; x. 48; xix. 5.

the matter will belong to the subsequent embellishment of events which underlies all our Gospels. Here we must include, for instance, Old Testament decoration such as that from Isaiah xl. 3-5—a passage from which, owing to the first words being incorrectly punctuated in the Greek translation (pp. 44 f. and 49 f.), a prophecy could be derived adapted to the "preacher in the wilderness." Translated literally, the passage runs: "A voice calls: Through the wilderness make a way for Yahwe,"[1] and the reference is to the people who were to be led back from the Babylonian captivity in 537 B.C.

3. *The Beginning of the Work of Jesus.*—Jesus himself did not take over the leadership of the reform movement until the Baptist had met his doom. Thus it was that in all probability His message was introduced in the same terms as that of John: "The kingdom of heaven is near at hand; have a new mind in you," or in some such words.[2] At the same time it is possible that, as in the case of Paul (Gal. i. 17), or Elijah, or Mohammed, He first retired into the wilderness for a time to collect His thoughts; for we may be sure that in these days His whole nature was deeply stirred. At any rate, to commune in this way with the Father would be quite in accordance with His habit (p. 17 f.).

In any case, we may be sure that the whole story of the temptation was not assigned chronologically to this sojourn in the wilderness until a later date. This trial, or rather the struggles of the soul on which, as described

[1] Cp. Mark i. 3 = Matthew iii. 3 = Luke iii. 4-6 = John i. 23.

[2] Mark i. 14 f. = Matthew iv. 32 f.; Mark vi. 14-16 = Matthew xiv. 1 f. = Luke ix. 7-9. John (iii. 23; cp. i. 7, 15-18, 26; iv. 1) wrongly represents Jesus and John as working contemporaneously.

by Jesus, the narrative is based, took place, at the earliest, in the middle of His public ministry, and perhaps not much before His decisive journey up to Jerusalem; for it was only then, as we shall see later (cp. above p. 36, and in particular pp. 124 f., 132 f.), that He finally made up His mind concerning any political aspirations. In giving forty days as the time of the stay in the wilderness, the story is simply following an Old Testament scheme taken from the account of the lives of Moses and Elijah (Exod. xxiv. 18; xxxiv. 28; 1 Kings xix. 8; cp. Acts i. 3). The threefold character of the temptation, the silencing of the promptings of hunger, the temptation to work a miracle, and the desire to exercise lordship, represent the artificial clothing of a writer well versed in the Old Testament.[1]

John, having extended his activity to the district of Peræa on the east of the Jordan, was imprisoned by Antipas, the ruler of this district (cp. p. 29), in the hill-fortress Machærus, on the east of the Dead Sea, and kept there for some time. Josephus tells us that the son of Herod feared the political influence of the Baptist; that is to say, no doubt, he was afraid of complications with the Romans, on whose favour the welfare of a petty prince depended, for the Baptist's preaching seemed to favour municipal freedom. Or it may be that the ruling class felt themselves to be threatened by the promise of a popular hero.

The New Testament assigns a reason for the hatred of John of a much more personal nature, a reason which in reality can only subsequently have been associated in a

[1] Matthew iv. 1-11 = Luke iv. 1-13. Mark (i. 12 f.) is seen in this case to be not original. Cp. Deut. viii. 3; vi. 16; vi. 13.

fatal way with the real motive for the imprisonment (Mark vi. 17-29 = Matthew xiv. 3-12 = Luke iii. 19-20). John, in the blunt language of a prophet, had rebuked the Galilean prince for having on a visit to his brother Philip drawn his wife away from him. Herod then drove forth his first wife, a daughter of the Nabatæan king, Aretas, and took this Herodias as his second, a woman of unbridled ambition. The Gospels describe the Baptist's execution in a very dramatic, though hardly historical, way. They represent it to have taken place at Machærus itself during a birthday feast in honour of Antipas. Pleased at the dancing of his step-daughter, and in a festive mood, Antipas promised with an oath in the hearing of his guests to give her anything she asked for. In reply, at the instigation of her mother, she requested that she might have the head of the Baptist upon a charger. The "king," who down to this time had hesitated to execute the prophet from fear of a rising amongst the people, was obliged to send for the head.[1]

The execution brought, if we are to believe Josephus, a Divine judgment upon Antipas; for the Nabatæan prince, incensed at the outrageous repudiation of his daughter, in the year 36 waged a war against him, which resulted in his defeat.

From this story in Josephus it was inferred that John's execution could not have taken place long before the year 36, the year of Antipas' defeat, if the people still remembered the Baptist. But we cannot be certain how long the recollection of the murder of a prophet, such as this, would remain fresh and vivid. No prophet was ever

[1] Cp. the article "John the Baptist" in *Encyclopædia Biblica.*

so much beloved by the people. The year 28 (29) is indicated as the more trustworthy date at which Jesus succeeded John as leader; this we have found as the result of our examination on pp. 25-30.

The news of the death of the Baptist, however, was brought to Jesus while He was in the midst of His work. It had a powerful effect upon His inner life. The shock resulted in His taking greater precautions, retiring to the safer north, and pondering over the Passion. He proceeds to act like one who calculates the cost of building a tower, or holds a review before the battle (Luke xiii. 31-33).

CHAPTER VIII

DURATION AND SCENE OF THE WORK

1. *Duration.*—When we think of the way in which Jesus of Nazareth has influenced humanity, we might be tempted to imagine that He had at least ten years in which to spread abroad His ideas. Yet the utmost length of time assigned Him for His work in the New Testament, if the matter is closely examined, amounts to two whole years and part of a third. This we learn from the Gospel according to John, and it is still customary even in the present day, especially in school lessons, to harmonise the Gospels and fit the whole of their contents into this space of three years, as if the correctness of this limit of time was as well known as anything could be.

Here the number of the years the public ministry of Jesus lasted is arrived at by enumerating the recorded journeys of Jesus to Jerusalem for the feasts. John represents Him as having kept three Passovers (ii. 13, 23; vi. 4; xi. 55 [xii. 12])[1] as a teacher of the people. The three older Evangelists, however, agree in telling us that He was present at one feast only (Mark xi. 11 = Matthew xxi. 10 = Luke xix. 28), and from this the Church

[1] We seem obliged to explain John v. 1 as referring to the feast of Purim or Pentecost.

Fathers also concluded that the Master's ministry lasted no more than one year. And, if the mere agreement of Mark, Matthew, and Luke could be regarded as an unquestionable indication of historical fact, we should be obliged to draw the same conclusion. But this "acceptable year of the Lord" seems to have originated from Luke iv. 19 (cp. Isaiah lxi. 2; Lev. xxv. 10). On the whole, all we can be sure of is, that the tragic Easter fixed itself in the minds of the disciples, who otherwise concerned themselves about nothing less than about precise chronicles and biography.

It is in itself likely enough that Jesus when He had grown up frequently visited the Temple-city (pp. 46 f.); and this even seems to be suggested in Matthew xxiii. 37 = Luke xiii. 34. In this respect, therefore, the latest Gospel perhaps comes for once more nearly to the historical fact than do the other three.[1] But we cannot now tell more precisely how long Jesus actually worked. He must, however, have been crucified while Pilate was procurator; and Pilate's procuratorship came to an end in the year 36 (37) A.D.

He taught, therefore, between 28 (29) A.D. and 36 (37) A.D. We can perhaps approach a little nearer still to the *terminus ad quem* of the life of Jesus if we remember that Paul became a Christian in the year 34 or 35. By that time, not only could Jesus no longer have been amongst the living, but time enough must have elapsed for the founding of the first communities in Palestine and among the Jews of the dispersion.

2. *The Scene.*—Jesus at first chose Galilee as the scene

[1] Could Luke xiii. 7-9 and 32 f. also be made to tell in favour of John?

of His activity. As to this fact we need no longer be led astray by the Fourth Gospel—a late work, singularly deficient in local colour. He made the choice, in the first place, doubtless because it was His native soil, and as such much more familiar to Him, simple peasant as He was, than were the domains of the priests and scribes in the south, but also, and still more, because He was less exposed here to the danger that might threaten Him from the Romans and the friends of Rome, to whom the Baptist had but recently fallen a victim. The reform movement must not be allowed to remain without a leader, even though for a time its adherents might be compelled to restrict their activities. This doubtless was the reason why Jesus was never so widely known to His people as John; even in the year 36 a lively recollection of the Baptist was everywhere preserved.[1] Nevertheless, Jesus' native place Nazareth can hardly have been the spot in which He began to preach, however convenient it may be for the investigator to represent Him as having come forward on a suitable occasion in the synagogue there, to preach independently after the reading of the Scripture;[2] for the prophet, as we are told, is nothing thought of in his native town or amongst his own people (Mark vi. 4 = Matthew xiii. 57*b* = Luke iv. 24). Where His relatives and all His movements were known to everybody, He was regarded with, at most, critical curiosity. But He can never have begun with a failure or repulse. It may be even that He did not return straight home from His baptism in Jordan, but that,

[1] Mark iii. 7 f. together with i. 28 seem to be a comprehensive anticipation.

[2] Luke iv. 16 alone is in favour of Nazareth, but already contains a reference to the works in Capernaum (iv. 23), to which Jesus does not come until iv. 31.

not until after John's voice as a preacher was hushed in silence, and He had collected and prepared himself, He directed His steps to the Galilean sea, the Lake of Gennesaret or Tiberias, which lies, embedded in the mountains, only a few hours' distance from Nazareth (Mark i. 14 = Luke iv. 14*a*, in contrast with Matthew iv. 12 f., which is confused).

This lake basin, some thirteen miles in length and seven in breadth, may be regarded as the centre of the at that time densely populated Galilee. At the present day the traveller encounters nothing but ruins in abundance. On the shores of this lake it was, especially on the north-west, which was at that time very fertile and the scene of a busy trade, Jesus first made His voice heard, and Capernaum (Tell Hum) must have been His starting-point.[1] Here His travels begin. We find Him now on this side of the lake, now on the other; then He returns to Capernaum. Here He meets the disciple who becomes for some time His host (p. 90 f.). Of other places by the lake in which Jesus worked, authentic mention is made of Chorazin and Bethsaida (Matthew xi. 20-24 = Luke x. 13, 15) to the north, Magdala (Luke viii. 2; Matthew xv. 39, Magadan ? *el Mejdel*) to the west, Gerasa to the south-east, close by the lake (Mark v. 1 = Luke viii. 26, 37 in contrast to Matthew viii. 28),[2] and also what is known as the Decapolis (Mark vii. 31).

It were but lost labour to attempt to describe in their original order the several journeys of the Master and His

[1] Matthew ix. 1 ["His town"]; Matthew xi. 23 f. = Luke x. 15; Matthew viii. 5 = Luke vii. 1; iv. 23; cp. also John ii. 12; iv. 47.

[2] This is not to be confused with the place of the same name lying farther in Peræa.

movements as a preacher, however often and on whatsoever authority this may have been essayed; for the descriptions in the Gospels are partly obscure and contradictory, and partly are drawn up in accordance with a scheme—combining things that do not belong together, and distributing things that ought not to be separated.[1] In short, as regards detail, the Evangelists no longer possessed a true historical description of the facts.

Only in a few situations of a peculiar character which they describe can the note of originality still be felt; instances are, the visit of the Teacher to Nazareth after He had already had some success elsewhere,[2] His retirement to Cæsarea Philippi (Paneas, Mark viii. 27 = Matthew xvi. 13), perhaps also His visits abroad to Phœnicia (Tyre and Sidon, Mark vii. 24, 31; cp. Matthew xv. 21 f.), and surely also the references to some mountain or to a ship on the lake, as the places from which He discoursed.

After a period of such activity in Galilee (Acts x. 37 f.) Jesus at last sought to bring matters to an issue in the capital; and this journey to Jerusalem proved to be the prelude to the last act in the drama of His life.

[1] Witness, for example, in Matthew the five groups of longer speeches in v.-vii., x., xiii., xviii., xxiii.-xxv., and the sevenfold arrangement of the shorter, xxiii. 13-36; xiii. 1-52; in Luke the record of the journey through Samaria, ix. 51–xviii. 14, interrupted by x. 1-17; xiii. 31, xiv. 1, etc.; ix. 57-62, examples of every kind of follower; xiv. 7-24, matters relating to hosts and the law of guests; in Mark, Sabbath stories, ii. 23–iii. 6; parables in iv. 1-33, addressed in the first instance to the people; then, according to *v.* 10, to the disciples only; but again, according to *v.* 33, to the people—thus a collection compiled from different sources. Cp. on this head the accounts of the Gospels in detail with the help of a synopsis or arrangement in parallel columns. See A. Wright's *Synopsis of the Gospels in Greek*.

[2] Mark vi. 1-6 = Matthew xiii. 53-58 = Luke iv. 16-30; for the last passage compare p. 72 f.

CHAPTER IX

PREACHING AND WORKS

1. *Style of Preaching.*—In the primitive records the ministry of Jesus is comprehensively summed up under two heads—words and work. And it is natural that the community of worshippers of Jesus, as well as the great mass of people in general in those days of belief in miracles and desire for them, should have attached first and foremost importance to His works.[1] For even at the present day people prefer to see proofs of Jesus' Divine power in that which is difficult to understand and which transgresses the laws of Nature. "Das Wunder ist des Glaubens liebstes Kind."[2] But they do this at the expense of the historical Jesus. We do not say this out of mere complaisance to the logician, or even to the modern man schooled in Natural Science, but simply as critics and investigators of the sources at our command. To Jesus himself His preaching had the first importance. For Him what was really great in the prophet Jonah was simply

[1] Luke xxiv. 19; Acts x. 38; Mark i. 38=Matthew iv. 23=Luke iv. 44. In the same connection a comparison of Mark vi. 34 with Matthew iv. 14, and finally, Luke ix. 11, or of Mark x. 1, with Matthew xix. 2 is very instructive.

[2] Goethe, *Faust* I. ("Miracle is faith's dearest child").

that preaching of repentance to the Ninevites which was so wonderfully effective.[1] He himself, too, came as a preacher and teacher.[2] Here again we have another fundamental fact of the oldest tradition—a fact which makes havoc of the traditional Christianity of the Churches. In the not distant future all teaching in schools and elsewhere will have to be brought rigidly into conformity with it. Jesus, employing a common figure, describes His work as that of the sower: He scatters His seed on varied soil—that of men's hearts.[3]

His style of speaking must have been captivating. At the very outset, in Galilee, He fascinates whole crowds of people. He powerfully influences the thought and life of many men, transforming their natures. He combined a natural and unrivalled eloquence with a most intense conviction such as made persons like Paul and Bismarck, men naturally slow of speech, into eloquent speakers. While all His words were suffused with the enthusiasm of a great

[1] Matthew xii. 39 and 41 (*v.* 40 is a later addition, due to the corresponding line of argument in xii. 42)=Luke xi. 29-32=Mark viii. 12; cp. Matthew xvi. 4.

[2] Mark i. 38=Luke iv. 43. The quotation of Isaiah xxxv. 5, lxi. 1, in Matthew xi. 5 f.=Luke vii. 22 f., too, shows that when the messengers came from the Baptist, Jesus himself laid stress only upon His message of salvation to the poor. He was concerned, as was Isaiah, with the blind, the lame, the leprous, the deaf, the dead *in spirit*. The preaching of salvation to the poor would not come in appropriately after physical miracles. True, the words in question were interpreted literally by the Evangelists; and they all took care to support their interpretation by stories of miracles whenever an opportunity offered. But the concluding clause, "Happy is he who does not take offence at me [my inconspicuous character]," points us back even now to the Master's real meaning. Matthew x. 8 is late, as many portions of the missionary instructions show.

[3] Matthew xiii. 3-9, 18-28=Luke viii. 5-8, 11-16=Mark iv. 3-8, 15-20.

idealist, He was quite free from the hare-brained restlessness of the enthusiast or the mental narrowness of a fanatic. One feels at once, too, how far removed He is from the dry quibbling of the learned men of the School. He spoke with power and with a Divine commission (Mark i. 22 = Luke iv. 32 = Matthew vii. 28 f.). Essentially, in point of fact, He was actually regarded as a prophet like John the Baptist (Matthew xxi. 11). He too, like Amos, the herdsman of Tekoa, had forsaken a handicraft.

The popular style and natural poetry of His speech have never been equalled. This is true even after His words have travelled from the East to the more sober West, and have been translated from the original Aramaic into late Greek, and thence into the German of Luther and the English of the Authorised Version. Thumbed hundreds and thousands of times by the people; handled and applied hundreds and thousands of times by great and small persons alike; they shine like the purest gold, but with ever renewed brilliancy. His words breathe the universal humanity of the Classics. And yet, when we go to the root of the matter, the forms which Jesus' eloquence takes are genuinely Eastern and Judaic.[1] So we find at one time short apophthegms and brilliant antitheses, the deepest thought in seeming paradox,[2] sentences wonderfully adapted to become winged words, or, again, magnificent figurative discourses or parables of all kinds, from mere suggestions to elaborate didactic stories. Hardly ever, indeed, do we find cases of the employment of real allegories

[1] Cp. what is known as the Wisdom-literature: the Book of Proverbs, Job, Ecclesiastes, the Wisdom of Solomon, the Wisdom of Jesus, son of Sirach.

[2] *E.g.* Mark xi. 23 = Matthew xvii. 20; Luke xvii. 6.

such as Paul and later Christian preachers used; for those small details which serve to illustrate many secondary ideas, as we find them in John,[1] for example, in the parable of the vine and the branches, are an artificial production, and so alien to the whole style of the Master, natural and unaffected as it was. Jesus' parables or similitudes are used simply to illustrate a single central idea. All else is mere embellishment. Nature and human life have to be painted in their truest colours, in order that the eternal truths of the kingdom of God may be impressed upon the minds of the people; we tried to make this clear when, in speaking of Jesus' youth, we described Nazareth and its surroundings (pp. 15-18). Jesus must have been led to use this figurative speech simply because it could be understood easily. In the nature of the case,[2] no other explanation for His so doing is possible. In the hot climate of the East, as was natural, men lived their life far more in the open air than we do. The shore of a lake, the summit of a mountain, the open field, the market-place or the street, differ widely from the meeting-house or the family circle as scenes for such discourses from the inmost depths of His soul as were delivered by the Nazarene prophet. But we have no reason to doubt[3] that Jesus

[1] John xv. 1-17.

[2] In Mark iv. 10-12=Matthew xiii. 10-15=Luke viii. 9 f. the idea of the Evangelists is that the Master specially favours the disciples by explaining to them figurative language which has been contrived in such a way as to disguise the truth from the people. As a matter of fact, the explanation was necessitated simply by their defective insight.

[3] In the description of Paul's missionary activity in Acts, indeed, the connection of his work with the Synagogue appears often to be "schematic" merely, that is, part of a preconceived order of events. And even for Jesus, synagogue teaching was doubtless at least not the first thing, since even John the Baptist preferred the open air. We

also attended the Sabbath service,[1] and visited the houses of hospitable persons, even when these were publicans and sinners, and therefore in bad repute in official quarters.[2] For Him it could not be wrong to associate with any persons, if in so doing He was helping the cause of God. The people regarded Him as a travelling preacher or Rabbi (cp. pp. 28 f. and 91 f.) such as they had had amongst them in great numbers since the second century. Such teachers were allowed to come forward publicly if they had completed their thirtieth year. Jesus received no payment for teaching. Love for men was the guiding principle of His life. This indeed was not of the sentimental and effeminate nature that the Church has so long, and even down to the present day, imagined it to be. Sentimentalism with its luxury of tears has no right to appeal to Jesus of Nazareth for support. His love involved not only sympathy with and goodwill towards all men, but also discipline and austerity (*e.g.* on the one hand, Mark vi. 34 = Matthew ix. 36, xiv. 14; on the other, Mark viii. 33 = Matthew xvi. 23). We may well apply to Him the words of Julius Hammer:—

> Zorn ist der Liebe zweite, heissre Flamme,
> Doch nur die Liebe sei des Zornes Amme.

Uncertain as the tradition so often is, we can still discern, and cannot help discerning, these facts.

are often reminded of the procedure of Socrates, the great Greek. In this connection a comparison of Mark vi. 6*b* with Matthew ix. 35 is interesting.

[1] Cp. for this Mark vi. 2 = Matthew xiii. 54 = Luke iv. 16-21, 28; Mark i. 21 = Luke iv. 31; Mark i. 29 = Matthew viii. 14 = Luke iv. 38; Mark iii. 1 = Matthew xii. 9 = Luke vi. 6; Mark i. 39 = Matthew iv. 23 = Luke iv. 15, 44.

[2] Mark ii. 16 = Matthew ix. 10 f. = Luke v. 29 f.; Matthew xi. 19.

We cannot suppose, however, that we have before us in the Gospels whole speeches[1] in the form in which Jesus delivered them. The Sermon on the Mount, our most valuable source for the Christianity of Christ (which, we may note in passing, in Luke vi. 17, 20-49 is called a sermon in the plain), is in its present form purely an artificial combination of sayings of the Lord, though of great value, a collection and condensation (p. 74, themes different; no connection; beatitudes and laws diversely given). Matthew xiii., too, the great parable-chapter as it is called, gathers into groups and pairs stories which Jesus certainly never recounted in one breath, but on different occasions (p. 110 f.). Regarded as sermons, the longest discourses formulated by the Evangelists would scarcely take more than eight to ten minutes to deliver.

We are, therefore, obliged to suppose that only the most precious gems of the Master's discourse were preserved amongst His disciples, and these without their setting; or, in other words, they were only rarely attached to a definite time and place. They received their setting, accidental or intentional as the case might be, at a much later date in writings in which we can still distinguish deposits of different ages. Jesus himself must have been in the habit of repeating His principal ideas again and again. In this way they made their impression. Now and again we come across repetitions which seem to indicate that the saying or figure in question was employed in different situations (*e.g.* Mark ix. 35 and x. 43 f.; Luke xiv. 11 and xviii. 14; Matthew xii. 39 and xvi. 4; cp. on the feedings, p. 86 f.). When we have done our best to collect sayings of the

[1] In most of the individual parables we may, indeed, be supposed to have, in essence, Jesus' own formulation.

Lord from every quarter,[1] we shall be obliged to confess that a great deal of most precious material has been lost to the world entirely.

But, when all has been said as regards the words of Jesus, the doubt which exists relates not to the substance of what was spoken, but only to the manner and the locality. Most of the sayings in their inspired form bear plainly on the face of them the mark of genuineness; the same is also indicated by the uniformity of His general view,[2] though, indeed, we are obliged to bear in mind, as we are already prepared to do, that Jesus' ideas developed even after His baptism by John. In fact, it is the moral and religious teaching of Jesus that, when the critic has carefully removed foreign elements derived from later development in the Church, can beyond anything else claim from internal evidence to be credible. One who feels doubt almost everywhere must draw the line where this message is concerned. This is not the mosaic-like product of a society, as Kalthoff suggests, but the masterpiece of an individual heroic soul guided by God.

2. *Healing of sick Persons.*—When we have realised that Jesus was impelled by a great love, we are able to realise also the character of His work as a healer. "Come unto me," he says, "all ye troubled and burdened ones, and I will give you rest" (Matthew xi. 28). These are words that do not refer to mental bondage merely, but to bodily affliction as well. This was one of the great and dis-

[1] Acts xx. 35. Of the sayings which have been collected from extra-canonical writings and Church Fathers probably hardly a dozen are genuine.

[2] Jesus did not possess, as the philosophers did, a "doctrinal system." He was not a scholar, but a born thinker and poet—a religious and moral genius.

tinguishing facts about Jesus, that He not only felt a sympathy and compassion which dispelled sorrow, but He had also helping hands for such as were sick.

We must, of course, remember that the average Jew of the time believed that every sufferer was a person marked by God. The Jew connected sin and disease together as cause and effect. This unsympathetic idea was unfortunate enough; but the effect was further heightened by anxiety about the general wellbeing. Lepers and lunatics, accordingly, were driven away from the towns to unclean places. We hear of them wandering amongst the tombs or in the highways.[1] The theory of medicine was still in its prescientific stage, and amongst the Jews, in particular, less advanced perhaps than anywhere else in the world. Evil spirits or "demons" were still supposed to be the originators of disease, every form of which was called "possession." People who were very ill had several, even whole legions, of evil spirits.[2] Jesus shared this belief with the rest of His contemporaries. On this point no false "enlightenment" ought to mislead us. Needless to say, we are not justified by the fact that He held this view in adopting this theory of medicine as the basis for Home Mission activity, as is still sometimes done even in the present century.

This theory, of course, did not preclude Jesus from practising as a "folk-physician." In so describing Him, we do not suggest that medicine was a profession requiring a special education amongst a population in which the

[1] Mark v. 2-5 = Luke viii. 27-29 = Matthew viii. 28; Luke xvii. 12; cp. 2 Kings vii. 3; Lev. xiii. 45 f.; exceptions are: 2 Kings xv. 5; Mark i. 23; v. 26 = Luke viii. 43, and John v. 2-9.

[2] Mark v. 9 = Luke viii. 30; Luke viii. 2.

treatment of sanitary matters formed part of the work of the priests (Mark i. 44 and parallels). We are thinking simply of care for and cure of the sick. Jesus often speaks of the physician.[1] He practises a popular style of healing. He does not despise helps or expedients of any kind.[2] But amid them all the most important thing was always His force of mind, the wonderful calm and energy of His personal character. No unprejudiced person can any longer doubt that He did allay and dispel certain kinds of infirmity susceptible to psychological influence (pastoral care and suggestion). On this point modern physicians and theologians are at one. But here again we must separate the historical kernel from the legendary husk. It must always be remembered that His power of healing was soon exaggerated to an immeasurable extent. Rumour is often like the rolling avalanche.[3] The real Jesus always, and on principle, declined to make use of the spectacular and the magical.[4] His aim was purely to serve His brethren, not to glorify himself.

What kinds of cure was Jesus really able to effect? We can only think of diseases of the mind and of the nerves, with which were associated defective speech, cramp, or forms of lameness and the like (Acts x. 38; cp. Luke xiii. 32). In such cases, the power of the word which calms, takes hold of the will, removes the sense of guilt

[1] (Mark ii. 17 = Matthew ix. 12 = Luke v. 31; Luke iv. 23 [ix. 11]).

[2] Mark v. 41, 43 = Luke viii. 55 f.; Mark vii. 33? Mark viii. 23 = John ix. 6? cp. Mark vi. 5, 13.

[3] This may be clearly seen from Mark i. 32, 34 = Matthew viii. 16 = Luke iv. 40; Mark iii. 7, 10 = Matthew xii. 15; Mark vii. 32-37 = Matthew xv. 29-31.

[4] Matthew viii. 11-13; xii. 39 [cp. p. 75 f.]; xvi. 4 = Luke xi. 29; cp. p. 66.

and destroys hallucinations, is capable of producing healing effects. To this category belong such truthful descriptions as those of the gradual cure of a lunatic (Mark v. 2-10, 15) and of an epileptic.[1] We even seem to hear of cases of relapse (Matthew xii. 43-45 = Luke xi. 24-26). In every instance, however, the sick person is cured only on condition that he submits himself entirely to the person who is to help him. Again and again Jesus speaks of the "faith" that has contributed to the cure.[2] Where such "faith" is wanting, as in Nazareth, He is not able to effect any cure.[3] Though people flocked to Him in crowds, He was only able to heal certain persons (Mark iii. 10; cp. p. 83, note 3). When we are told more than this, we see the influence of that spirit of worship which exaggerates everything. We must regard all the cases in which masses of persons are represented as having been healed at the same time as untenable (for example, Mark vi. 56 = Matthew xiv. 35 f.). Even more so must we regard all cures effected from a distance.[4]

There is evidence, however, of the existence of a healing power in general, not only in the case of Jesus, but also in the Church down to the second century. Most important

[1] (Mark ix. 14-29; similarly Mark i. 23-28 = Luke iv. 33-37.) It is best to leave the cures of lameness in the hand (Mark iii. 1-6 = Matthew xii. 9-14 = Luke vi. 6-11) and in the foot (Mark ii. 1-12 = Matthew ix. 1-8 = Luke v. 17-26) out of consideration as being uncertain. The accounts have, at least, been very much coloured at a later date.

[2] Mark v. 34; ix. 23 f.; Matthew ix. 28; Mark ii. 5 = Matthew ix. 2 = Luke v. 20; Matthew viii. 10 = Luke vii. 9; Matthew xv. 28 = Mark vii. 29.

[3] In Mark vi. 5 f. In Matthew xiii. 58 these historical facts are already attenuated.

[4] Matthew viii. 13 = Luke vii. 10; Matthew xv. 28.

in this connection is the information given by Paul in 2 Cor. xii. 12 and Rom. xv. 19, about his own power. The reproach of Jesus' opponents among the Pharisees, that when He worked wonders He was in league with one of the higher demons (Beelzebub; Mark iii. 22 = Matthew xii. 24 [ix. 34] = Luke xi. 15), is proof enough that they had no doubts about the reality of His cures; so, indeed, is the fact that this same power of healing was ascribed to the disciples of the Pharisees and others.[1] Jesus himself, deeply stirred, recognised God to be the cause, and lifted himself to Him in prayer.[2]

It is probable, further, that certain other healings which appear wonderful, but in reality were effected in a way quite as natural, should be added to the cures mentioned above. Here we may include the cure of Peter's mother-in-law who was sick of a fever.[3] Perhaps, also, we may add the story of Jairus' daughter, "the one accredited event in the Gospel story, which must have seemed like an awakening from the dead to those who took part in it."[4] The key to a natural explanation of this narrative—to which attention has very rightly been called—is the account of what befell Eutychus in the Acts of the Apostles (xx. 7-12). In this narrative, Paul, bending over the young man who has fallen from the balcony, comes to the conclusion that he is still alive, and only in a swoon. Similarly Mark—here again an original authority

[1] Matthew xii. 27 = Luke xi. 19; cp. Mark ix. 38 f. = Luke ix. 49 f.; Matthew vii. 22.

[2] Mark v. 19 = Luke viii. 39; Mark ix. 29 = Matthew xvii. 21; Luke xvii. 15-17.

[3] Mark i. 29-31 = Matthew viii. 14 f. = Luke iv. 38 f.; cp. Acts xxviii. 8; also Mark v. 25-34 and parallels.

[4] Schmiedel. Mark v. 22-43 = Matthew ix. 18-26 = Luke viii. 40-56.

—tells us that the twelve-year old child in the house of Jairus lay at the last gasp, and that Jesus simply pronounced her to be asleep (*vv.* 23, 39). Thus, doubtless, the girl was suffering from some form of tonic spasm from which Jesus succeeded in rousing her. The people regarded this success in another light. Here was a miracle, they thought, and they marvelled at Jesus as one who was able to raise from the dead; thus we are able to account for the currency of such stories as those of the young man at Nain (only Luke vii. 11-17) and Lazarus at Bethany (only John xi. 1-46).[1]

Events having once happened which indicated that the Master was rarely endowed and possessed no ordinary power, it was very natural that soon some of His parables should be converted into records of actual facts. Examples of such unintentional transformation are by no means rare. Amongst these the first place should be assigned to the feeding of the five thousand and of the four thousand.[2] It is very natural to suppose that these were originally oft-repeated parables. By the bread, in the first instance, Jesus' teaching was meant. This is proved by such passages as Mark viii. 14-21 = Matthew xvi. 5-12 (cp. Matthew v. 6; John vi. 35, 63), where the reference to the story of the feeding leads to the conviction that Jesus wished to speak, not of bread, but of His teaching. The following figure will make the meaning quite clear:—When a mother divides a loaf of bread between twelve children,

[1] Happily people have nowadays given up the attempt to save as many stories as possible by finding a natural explanation, or by special pleading. Yet we might still justifiably attempt to explain naturally the seeming cure from a distance in Mark vii. 30.

[2] Mark vi. 32-44 = Matthew xiv. 13-21 = Luke ix. 10-17 = John vi. 1, 14; Mark viii. 1-10 = Matthew xv. 32-38; cp. p. 80 f.

each one, of course, receives less than if there were only two children. But if she is able to share her love or her knowledge with twelve instead of with two, love and truth do not decrease, but increase. An explanation like this has not been invented by perplexed scholars; it has been rediscovered.

It is the same with the story of the cursing of the fig-tree. Luke does not give it, but in its place a beautiful parable of hope and patience (xiii. 6-9). This is the original.[1] Not until the last days did Jesus' hope and patience fail Him; and then it was that He reproached and cursed the "tree," that is to say, His people. People who delight in the miraculous, convert the "tree" of this figure of speech into a real fig-tree which is expected to produce fruit at Easter, though figs only ripen from June onwards (Mark xi. 12-14, 20 f. = Matthew xxi. 18 f.). They quite forget that their revered Master suffers great derogation from His dignity when they attribute to Him purposeless anger against a lifeless creature.

Peter's great draught of fish can be fittingly explained in the same way (Luke v. 4-11 [= John xxi. 1-14]). We must go back to Mark i. 17 and Matthew xiii. 47-50. The piece of money in the fish's belly, too, is clearly intended to be understood figuratively (Matthew xvii. 24-27). The fish itself when sold will provide money with which to pay the tax. We shall not appear arbitrary and bold now if we suppose that the stories of the storm on the Lake of Gennesareth[2] and of the walking on the sea[3] had a similar

[1] Cp. also the figure of the fig-tree, Mark xiii. 28 = Matthew xxiv. 32 = Luke xxi. 29 f.

[2] Mark iv. 35-41 = Matthew viii. 18, 23-27 = Luke viii. 22-25.

[3] Mark vi. 45-53 = Matthew xiv. 22-34 = John vi. 16-21.

origin. Jesus, we may be sure, spoke of the storm and breakers of life and of a faith that conquers everything. We might even attempt to explain similarly the changing of water into wine at Cana (John ii. 1-11), Jesus' teaching being contrasted with Judaism, like wine with water. But in this case the symbolism of the Last Supper seems to be already at work,[1] and the ideas underlying the story seem to have been coined by the community of Jesus' worshippers. Ultimately any omission in the picture of the worker of miracles was supplied by worshippers of Jewish extraction, who availed themselves of passages and descriptions in the Old Testament, interpreting them as prophecies. We have already become familiar with this kind of procedure (p. 43 f.; cp. pp. 49-54). For instance, great prophets like Elijah and Elisha had long been held to give evidence of their qualifications by miraculously supplying food or awakening people from the dead.[2] Passages like Isaiah xxxv. 5 f.; lxi. 1; Wisdom x. 21, suggested all kinds of healings. Again, such expressions as we find in Psalm cvii. 23-32 (storm on a lake) and 1 Kings xiii. 6 (withered hand) furnished all kinds of thoughts and touches. We might refer to many more passages, but we wish, in this matter especially, to beware of being finical.

[1] Spiritual symbols abound in John.

[2] 2 Kings iv. 42-44; cp. Exod. xvi.; Num. xi.; 1 Kings xvii. 17-24; 2 Kings iv. 17-37.

CHAPTER X

THE DISCIPLES

1. *The Twelve and the wider Circle of Followers.*—Jesus first came forward, like John, simply as a teaching reformer or prophet; this is shown by the fact that, like John, He soon founded a kind of School. He needed men to assist Him in His preaching. The feeling expressed in Matthew ix. 37 f. = Luke x. 2 must by degrees have been impressed upon Him more and more forcibly—"the harvest is great, but the labourers are few." Out of the crowds of listeners that gathered round Him, He selected some of the most trustworthy. A quick insight into character and good fortune as well must have co-operated to help Him in this task; for He seems to have been deceived only in one disciple, Judas of Kerioth.[1] When He chose these men, He can hardly be supposed to have had any plan which made the number twelve necessary; the number, let us say rather, was filled up by degrees. At first they were nothing more than certain individuals from among the petty folk from whom He himself had sprung (were they all over thirty years of age?), with whom He had become friendly, and whom He had the power of permanently

[1] Cp. article "Judas Iscariot" in *Encyclopædia Biblica.*

attaching to himself. Two pairs of brothers are named. Simon and his brother Andrew, fishermen, belonged doubtless (otherwise in John i. 44) to Capernaum.[1] Simon is better known to us by his Greek surname Peter, given to him by the Master. Peter, or, as Paul gives it—using the form common in Aramaic, the native language of Jesus—Cephas, suggests some such meaning as man of rock, or the like.[2] This disciple, or it may be his mother-in-law, owned a house at Capernaum in which Jesus often found shelter (p. 73). John and James, sons of Zebedee and of Salome, also came from the lake-side. The call of the two pairs of fishermen is recounted very summarily in Mark i. 16-20 = Matthew iv. 18-22. Regarding John, the tradition afterwards arose that he was held in special affection by Jesus (John xiii. 23-25). We find one of each pair of brothers, Peter and John, as pillars of the early Church, along with James the brother of the Lord, after Jesus had been taken away (Gal. i. 18 f.; ii. 1-10). But the same two, with James the other son of Zebedee, seem to have been privileged to enjoy a closer intercourse with Jesus even during His lifetime. It was they who accompanied Jesus when He entered the house of Peter's mother-in-law, and of Jairus, the ruler of the synagogue, as a healer (Mark i. 29; v. 37 = Luke viii. 51); and the same three disciples figure in the account of the transfiguration (Mark ix. 2 = Matthew xvii. 1 = Luke ix. 28), in Gethsemane (Mark xiv. 33 = Matthew xxvi. 37), and elsewhere (Mark xiii. 3) as His chosen companions. In the lists of disciples, too, they always stand first.

Of such catalogues we have four: Mark iii. 16-19 =

[1] Mark i. 21, 29 = Luke iv. 31, 38; also Matthew viii. 5, 14.

[2] The conferring of the name is placed too early in John i. 42.

Matthew x. 2-4 = Luke vi. 13-16 = Acts i. 13. In addition to the three disciples mentioned, these include seven names —in different order, it is true, but otherwise in agreement with each other: Levi, called Matthew, a publican, and a penman (?);[1] Philip (according to John i. 44, of Bethsaida?); Bartholomew; Thomas the doubter; James called the Less, son of Alphæus; Simon the zealot of Cana (p. 37); and Judas of Kerioth in Judæa, the betrayer. For the rest, Mark and Matthew assign the eleventh place to Thaddæus (or Lebbæus), and the Luke-writings the twelfth to Judas, a relative of a James. We cannot here decide whether Thaddæus = Lebbæus = Judas, or whether the Judas mentioned by Luke alone was the brother of James the Less, and so a son of Alphæus.[2] We need not be surprised that the names of the twelve are partly Greek, since Galilee had been under Hellenistic influence for three hundred years.

Jesus' selection of an inner circle of twelve disciples is in harmony with His desire to send them forth to the twelve tribes of His people (Luke xxii. 30 = Matthew xix. 28; cp. Acts xix. 6). The selection of a substitute for Judas Iscariot, as recorded in Acts i. 21-26, shows that importance was wont to be attached to the number twelve (cp. 1 Cor. xv. 5-7). This Judas, be it remarked, seems to have been the last to join the band (p. 152 f.). But the name Apostle was certainly not given to the chosen ones (otherwise in Luke vi. 13) by Jesus, but only by a later generation. With these brethren the Master journeyed from place to place, lived, spoke, and

[1] Cp. Mark ii. 14 = Luke v. 27 f. = Matthew ix. 9, and what is said above (pp. 7 ff., Preliminary).

[2] Cp. O. Holtzmann, *Life of Jesus*, pp. 235 ff.

ate.[1] In view of the solemnity of His mission, and looking forward as He did to the end of the world as imminent, He himself was not permitted to know the blessings of family life (Matthew xix. 12). They addressed Him as Rabbi or Rabboni (the Galilean-Aramaic form of the term), that is to say, literally, "Master." To them it was that He explained, often distressed at their foolishness, what had remained obscure in His discourses.[2] Such as they were, He was constrained to send them forth—whether by pairs must, in view of the number twelve, which suggests that they were sent singly to preach, remain a question in spite of Mark vi. 7 = Luke x. 1, and to heal, like himself, simply in return for shelter. Thus they worked for a short time for their Master and as collaborators with Him (Mark vi. 30 = Luke ix. 10*a*). His charges to them, as handed down to us,[3] in many details certainly bear unmistakable evidence of the influence of later Christian custom (*e.g.* Matthew x. 11-13, 16-22; Luke xii. 11 f.). It is probable, however, in spite of Matthew xix. 29 and the sorrowful declaration by Jesus regarding complete renunciation in Matthew viii. 20 = Luke ix. 58, that these emissaries did not give up their civil callings entirely; for as occasion offers we find them attending to matters of maintenance.[4] Jesus himself, of course, needed to be free to devote himself without distraction to spiritual things. The twelve all belonged to the petty folk; they

[1] *E.g.* Mark xiv. 17 = Matthew xxvi. 20 = Luke xxii. 14; Mark x. 32 = Matthew xx. 17 = Luke xviii. 31.

[2] Mark iv. 34, ix. 11 = Matthew xvii. 10; Mark viii. 16-21 = Matthew xvi. 7-12.

[3] Mark vi. 7-13 = Matthew x. 1-42 = Luke ix. 1-5; xii. 11 f.

[4] Matthew xvii. 24-27; Mark vi. 37 f. = Matthew xiv. 16 f. = Luke ix. 13; cp. Acts xviii. 3; xx. 33 f.; 1 Cor. iv. 12.

were for the most part fishermen and handicraftsmen, as were the earliest worshippers and disciples of Jesus in general (Luke x. 21). Occasionally we are told of other adherents of Jesus: of soldiers, in Matthew viii. 5-13 = Luke vii. 1-10; of scribes only, in Matthew viii. 19 and Mark xii. 34. These belonged to the wider circle which often thronged round the Master (Luke xix. 37). It is difficult to determine how wide this circle was. We may be sure that even if crowds listened to the Master and followed Him in hosts, there were but few who remained really faithful to Him (*e.g.* Luke xii. 32), and there was no idea of any organisation. We may guess the number of His adherents from the fact that the first Church at Jerusalem consisted of 120 members (Acts i. 15). The statement in Luke (x. 1-12, 17-20), indeed, that He had about Him a wider circle of seventy disciples, is merely the construction of one who had in mind the mission to the heathen; for in accordance with the enumeration in Genesis x. the number of heathen peoples in the world was placed at seventy.[1]

2. *The Women.*—The women who accompanied Jesus and hung on His words occupied a special and peculiar position in the community of His disciples. In the first instance, it was gratitude for benefits received that bound them to Him;[2] in particular, Mary of Magdala, who had been seriously and perhaps recurrently deranged in mind, and now was visibly healed.[3] These women-disciples, who were often relatives of men-disciples, were ready, as befitted their sex, to attend to the simple household needs of the

[1] We read in Exod. xxiv. 1, 9, that Moses, too, had a staff of seventy men about him.

[2] Luke viii. 2; cp. vii. 36-50 = Mark xiv. 3-9 = Matthew xxvi. 6-13.

[3] It is quite wrong to regard her as a typical figure of the penitent harlot.

Master. They shared their own possessions with Him (Luke x. 41 f.). Amongst them, Joanna, wife of Chuza, who was a steward in the service of Antipas, seems to represent the well-to-do class. In addition to the two already spoken of, Luke viii. 1-3 mentions only a certain Susanna by name. The beautiful, and doubtless also trustworthy story of the meditative Mary and the bustling Martha, two other female disciples, is found only in Luke (x. 38-42; cp. John xi. 1; xii. 2 f.). With what fidelity His women-followers clung to Jesus, is shown by the fact that they alone were spectators, though distant, of His death, and perhaps rendered Him the last honours (Mark xv. 47 and parallels?) when all the men-disciples, even the courageous Peter, had fled to their homes.[1] They formed an important element in the early Church as women-helpers (Acts i. 14). At a later date women such as these were called "deaconesses" (Rom. xvi. 1 f.), and from the second century "widows."[2] They ministered as nurses to strangers, the poor, the sick, and prisoners. By the time the early Church had closed its ranks, Jesus' mother Mary also had attached herself to these women.

We have here an early indication of the great part played by women at a later date in the history of Christianity. They paved the way for the entrance of the new religion into the princely houses of the Romans. They became heroines, ever ready to help people in a hundred different ways. They fill our churches at the present, and ennoble the homes of those who work or those who play in a hundred different ways—homes which, if it were not for them, would be godless indeed.

[1] Mark xv. 40 f. = Matthew xxvii. 55 f. = Luke xxiii. 49.

[2] Cp. article "Deacon" in *Encyclopædia Biblica*.

CHAPTER XI

THE ESSENCE OF JESUS' PREACHING

1. *The term Gospel.*—Jesus' teaching is now known throughout the world by the Greek term "evangelium," which means in English "glad-tidings" or "news of salvation," of good fortune brought by God. Even if the formula in Mark i. 15, "Change your mind (repent), and believe in the Gospel," sounds as if it had been framed at a later date under the influence of Pauline ideas,[1] it still remains not impossible that Jesus himself linked His words with those of the later prophecy called by the name of Isaiah (Isaiah xl.-lxvi.)—Mark viii. 35; x. 29. The bringing of tidings of good fortune is spoken of in Isaiah lxi. 1; xli. 27; cp. 2 Samuel xviii. 20-27 and 2 Kings vii. 9; Luke iv. 18 refers expressly to Isaiah lxi. 1. In any case Jesus' message, and soon indeed the whole tradition regarding His person, came to receive the name "evangelium." It was not until after the middle of the second century that, in addition to this, the separate books containing the preaching and history of Jesus were described by the same word. Only the four most important of these have been received into the New Testament.

[1] Cp. *e.g.* also Mark xiii. 10=Matthew xxiv. 14*a*; Mark xiv. 9=Matthew xxvi. 13.

2. *God the Father and the Children of Men.*—What is the kernel of this message, the distinctively new feature? It is not the preaching of the coming of the kingdom of God. This is a heritage taken over by the Baptist from the prophets, only recast. The central feature of Jesus' whole religious outlook is revealed rather by the idea of the fatherhood of God. It is in this that He is distinguished from John (p. 62 f.). It is this that imparts to His whole preaching its bright, kindly, gentle, large-hearted character, genial gentleness and deep-heartedness —features which, when we come to analyse them, can only be understood as reflections of what He himself was (cp. pp. 106 f., 117 f.). We do not by any means forget that even in the Old Testament God is described as the Father. When therefore Jesus said (Matthew xiii. 52), "Every scribe who is instructed for the kingdom of heaven is like a householder who brings forth from his treasure things new and old," the saying applied to the whole of His own ministry. But the equation Yahwè (Jehovah) = Father in the Old Testament, is only occasional and accidental, even in those passages which approach the height of Christianity in the value it attaches to the individual person in the religious aspect.[1] Apart from these, God continues to appear for the most part as Father of the people of Israel[2] and of its kings.[3] It is interesting to note that the designation Father as a name for Yahwè was not introduced until the times of the prophets. The relationship of Jesus to

[1] Psalms lxviii. 6; ciii. 13; Ecclus. li. 10; xxiii. 1, 4; Wisdom ii. 13; xiv. 3; Malachi ii. 10.

[2] Jer. iii. 4, 19; Isaiah lxiii. 16, lxiv. 7; 3 Macc. vi. 2-15; Tob. xiii. 2-18; Deut. i. 31, viii. 5; xxxii. 6; Malachi i. 6; cp. Hosea xi. 1; Isaiah i. 2; Jer. xxxi. 20.

[3] Psalm lxxxix. 27; 2 Samuel vii. 14; cp. Psalm ii. 7.

the prophets is shown by this fact. The ideas to be found in the post-Christian writings of Jewish Rabbis as to the Fatherhood of God can easily have been influenced by Christianity (cp. Seneca).

Whatever may be said in other directions, the real service of Jesus consists in this: He took up this casual metaphor with all His heart and made it the immovably fixed pivot of all religion. We are unable to determine precisely (p. 62 f.) when it was that this conviction became rooted in His mind. This is a secret known only to God. But we realise with ever-increasing clearness in these days how intense was the energy with which, from the time of His baptism by John, He constantly set forth His new knowledge of God.

Grandest of all in this respect down to the present day has been the influence exerted by the model prayer which He gave to His disciples. At an early date it was used in Divine worship and adapted for the purpose (for the closing words, added later to round it off, cp. the source in 1 Chron. xxix. 11). Even to-day it is the real confession of faith which unites all Christendom. We find it recorded twice in the New Testament, in Matthew vi. 9-13 and Luke xi. 1-4; the name "Father" appears again in an Aramaic form in the "Abba" of Gal. iv. 6 and Rom. viii. 14 f. But there are other passages also, especially in the Sermon on the Mount (p. 80 f.), where God is frequently spoken of as "your Father," or "thy Father," meaning Father of every individual.[1] In accordance with this, influenced, of course, in the first instance by His own religious feeling, Jesus calls God His Father; but

[1] Cp. Matthew v.-vii. and Mark xi. 25; Matthew x. 20, 29; xviii. 14; xxiii. 9; Luke xii. 32.

so far, originally, was He from thinking of an exclusive relationship in this, that in the whole of the Sermon on the Mount the expression "my Father" appears only once (Matthew vii. 21). Later, indeed, it receives a Messianic colouring (*e.g.* Matthew xvi. 17; xviii. 10, 19; xxv. 34). From the outset, too, the designation of the God who overshadows all as simply "the Father" (Mark xiii. 32; Matthew xi. 27*b* = Luke x. 22*b*; xi. 13) was frequently in the mouth of Jesus; and at a later date, as early as the Gospel according to John, it established itself as a proper name. This Father-God watches over and lovingly guides the whole creation, caring not only for the lilies of the field, but also, and much more, for the children of men.[1] Why should we allow ourselves to be outworn with anxiety and care when we know that without Him not one hair of a man's head, and not one sparrow from the house-top perishes (Matthew x. 29-31 = Luke xii. 6 f.)?

God's greatest gift to men, however, is forgiveness (fifth petition, Matthew vi. 14 f.; parable of the unmerciful slave, Matthew xviii. 23-35). It is great beyond measure. The real Jesus actually declared that even an offence against His own person might be forgiven; the point at which He drew the line was Satanic hatred of the good (Matthew xii. 31 f.; cp. p. 10 f.). Jesus consoled men by assuring them of God's forgiveness. Ultimately, therefore, it is not He himself who forgives, but only God.[2] Mankind from the very beginning has been the child or son[3] of this gracious Father-God. The Son of God

[1] Matthew vi. 25-34 = Luke xii. 22-31; Matthew vii. 7-11 = Luke xi. 9-13.

[2] Luke xxiii. 34; Mark ii. 5-12 = Matthew ix. 2-7 = Luke v. 20-25; vii. 47-50; the parable of the fig-tree, Luke xiii. 6-9.

[3] Sons of God, Matthew v. 45, 9; Luke vi. 35. Both expressions

slumbers in the Son of man. All these ideas about the Father-God and the Son of man receive their grandest illustration in that parable of the lost son which Luke alone has preserved (xv. 11-32), but which, nevertheless, is to be regarded as the very inmost heart of the Gospel. The two sons are explained by Jesus, not as pointing to the contrast between Judaism and heathenism, as has been common since the very beginning of the mission to the heathen, which was looked upon with displeasure by the Jews, but as signifying different types of men amongst the Jews themselves. In doing so He does not recognise at all the need of a mediation between God and men. God himself anticipates man and his words of penitent acknowledgment of wrong-doing. God does not speak of forgiveness of sins, but acts under the impulse of love. The Pauline development of Christian thought cannot but miss here the mediator between God and man, Jesus Christ, without whose death as a sacrifice God could not be merciful to the sinner. How much more the creed of the Church. Jesus himself, however, did not miss it. He was satisfied with simply pointing the way to the Father-God.

3. *The Worship of the Heart.*—In this filial relationship of man to God it is the attitude of the soul that is alone important (Matthew v. 44 f.; Mark iii. 35 = Matthew xii. 50). In this stress so continually laid on the feeling of the heart, is again revealed the close relationship between Jesus and the greatest prophets of Israel (Amos, Hosea [vi. 6 cited in Matthew ix. 13; xii. 7], Isaiah, Jeremiah, Micah, Zechariah, Joel). As with them so also with

interchange. Luther and our Authorised Version (not the Revised), unfortunately, obliterate this fact in their translation. Like the Fourth Evangelist, they use "Son" only of Jesus.

Jesus, sin everywhere (according to Gen. viii. 21) is breaking the bond of love between God and man. The will of God is violated by sin, if only in the "inmost recesses of the heart" (Matthew v. 21 f., 27 f.). The battle rages within ourselves (Mark xiv. 38 = Matthew xxvi. 41). The first thing required of us, therefore, if we would serve God, is to "think differently," to "change our mind"—as the Baptist had already proclaimed (p. 66). This is illustrated in an incomparable manner in the profound parable of the prodigal son. Jesus alludes elsewhere to the penitent's "return to his father's house," in Luke xiii. 3, 5; Matthew xi. 20 f. = Luke x. 13; Matthew xiii. 15 = Mark iv. 12 [Isaiah vi. 10]; and again in the parable of the two sons (Matthew xxi. 28-32) and in that of the Pharisee and publican (Luke xviii. 9-14; cp. also Matthew xviii. 3). After his return home the prodigal must go on cherishing the true filial spirit. It was not once only, we may be sure, that Jesus illustrated the childlike spirit in religion from the living model, in the manner so touchingly described in Mark x. 13-16 = Luke xviii. 15-17 = Matthew xix. 13-15.[1] We can very easily understand why the Master should have been fond of children. Children are so meek, so harmless, so natural, so conscious of their own weakness. They exemplify what is meant by poverty in spirit, by which is understood not poverty in talent, but the need for God and for the true religious possessions of the soul (first beatitude in Matthew v. 3). This gives rise to a "hunger and thirst" after God, religious aspiration, the central feeling of all religion, as we should say nowadays (fourth beatitude in Matthew v. 6).

By "faith," frequently as the word is met with in the

[1] Cp. Mark ix. 36 = Luke ix. 47 = Matthew xviii. 2 f.

Gospels, Jesus hardly ever designates this power of the soul, which lays hold of and clings to the Father-God. Perhaps He does so in Mark ix. 42; xi. 22-24 = Matthew xxi. 21 f. = Luke xvii. 6; Matthew xvii. 20; xxiii. 23; the application of the word in Luke viii. 12; xviii. 8; xxii. 32, does not come from Jesus himself (cp. p. 95 f.). By faith He means, rather, the people's unshakable confidence in His divinely-given power of healing and His influence over men's souls. It is chiefly the physical benefit of bodily health that is sought by this means.[1] In its perfect form this child-feeling is love for God. Already in Deut. vi. 4 f. we find these words: "Hear, ye Israelites, Yahwè is our God, Yahwè alone! Ye shall love Yahwè your God with your whole heart, and with your whole soul, and with your whole strength." By the Jews these words were already regarded as a fundamental maxim of religion. To Jesus they were even more: they were the greatest commandment, the Alpha and Omega of His knowledge of Divine things.[2] At a later date the literature ascribed to John (the Fourth Gospel; 1st, 2nd, and 3rd Epistles of John) supplied amplifications of this fundamental motive in never-to-be-forgotten words (particularly in 1 John iv. 16, "God is love, and he who abides in love, abides in God, and God in him"; cp. John xiii. 34 f.; xv. 12; 1 John iv. 19). Let the heart be with God, says Jesus. Heavenly treasures alone are not consumed by moth and rust.[3] In

[1] Mark ii. 3-5 = Luke v. 18-20 = Matthew ix. 2; Mark v. 36 = Luke viii. 50; Mark ix. 23 f.; Matthew viii. 8-13 = Luke vii. 6-10; Matthew ix. 28; Mark iv. 40 = Luke viii. 25 = Matthew viii. 26; Mark ix. 19 = Matthew xvii. 17 = Luke ix. 41. Mark v. 34 = Matthew ix. 22 = Luke viii. 48; Mark x. 52 = Luke xviii. 42; Luke vii. 50; xvii. 19, are to be understood in the same way; cp. p. 84.

[2] Mark xii. 29 f. = Matthew xxii. 37 f. = Luke x. 26 f.

[3] Mark vi. 19-21 = Luke xii. 33 f.; Matthew vi. 33 = Luke xii. 31.

a remarkable parable, that of the wedding garment, which does not really form part of the preceding narrative (Matthew xxii. 11-13), Jesus describes the state of a human soul in harmony with God. It must above all things be prepared to renounce material prosperity,[1] the many distractions of secular business (see the parable of the great feast, Matthew xxii. 1-10 = Luke xiv. 15-24; cp. Mary and Martha, Luke x. 38-42), the ties of blood and its joys. In this Jesus himself set the example, not without pain and a severe struggle ending in victory over himself.[2] Similarly He expects His followers to abandon all other considerations where the cause of God is involved.[3] This spirit of renunciation must be ready to endure physical suffering,[4] and even to sacrifice life itself;[5] for "What would it help a man, if he gained the whole world and harmed his own soul?" It was this spirit of heroic love for God that gave Christians power to endure bloody persecution in the early days under the Roman Empire, and made martyrs of weak girls. Later it showed itself

[1] Mark x. 17-26 = Matthew xix. 16-25 = Luke xviii. 18-26; cp. Luke xiv. 12-14.

[2] The true relatives, Mark iii. 33-35 = Matthew xii. 48-50 = Luke viii. 21; Luke xi. 27 f.; renunciation of marriage, Matthew xix. 10-12; dispensing with a home of His own, Matthew viii. 19-28 = Luke ix. 57-61; cp. p. 23 f.

[3] Matthew x. 34-37 = Luke xii. 49-53, with extravagant harshness in Luke xiv. 26.

[4] Matthew v. 29 f.; Mark ix. 43-48 = Matthew xviii. 8 f., eighth and ninth beatitude, Matthew v. 10-12 = Luke vi. 22 f. "The plucking out of the eye" is a metaphor in the Oriental style. Similar prescriptions were taken literally by Buddhists. But such self-mutilation would not stifle the evil desire in the heart.

[5] Matthew x. 38 f. = Luke xiv. 27; Matthew xvi. 24-26 = Luke ix. 23-25 = Mark viii. 34-37. The idea of the cross would seem certainly not to have been introduced until after Jesus' death. Before this we do not know of its use in a spiritual sense.

countless times in the history of the Church. Even at the present day it echoes again in the fourth verse of Luther's unique hymn, "Ein feste Burg."

> And, though they take our life,
> Goods, honour, children, wife,
> Yet is their profit small;
> These things shall vanish all,
> The city of God remaineth.

The relationship of men to God as sons, and the interchange of love between God and man, lead naturally to a new relationship between man and man—that of love for one's neighbour or one's brother. The second great commandment bids men cherish this love.[1] The wording of it was taken by Jesus from Lev. xix. 18, where it is said, "Thou shalt not be vindictive towards thy fellow-countryman, and shalt not bear any grudge against him, but thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. For I am Yahwè."

It is true that here, as elsewhere in the Old Testament, the term "neighbour" is restricted to members of the people of Israel. Any one who is an enemy of Israel is therefore to be hated (Matthew v. 43). To this Jesus opposes His own lofty teaching. In the parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke x. 29-37) we are told that any man whom we can serve and help is our neighbour. The barrier of nationality is no obstacle here. In the Sermon on the Mount the admonition develops into a command to love one's enemy, and this remains the highest ideal (Matthew v. 44-48 = Luke vi. 27 f., 35 f.). What is meant is not love in the sense of natural sympathy—which can never be commanded—but that victory over oneself which

[1] Matthew xxii. 39 f. = Luke x. 27 = Mark xii. 31; cp. Matthew xix. 19.

bears fruit in good-will towards others. What down to the time of Jesus the religions of the world had at best succeeded in eliciting as a rare emotional force in a limited number of outstanding individuals, in His hands became a general law founded on a requirement which embraces and enfolds a whole ethical system (Matthew vii. 12): "What ye would that men should do to you, do ye so to men: for this is the law and the prophets." It is, it may be hoped, hardly necessary here to point out that this rule means a great deal more than the mean maxim of wary egoism: "As thou to me, so I to thee." For so far as we ourselves are concerned we always choose for ourselves only what is good and beneficial. We ought, accordingly, to have no other feeling but love for our brothers and sisters. Our own experience should but serve to show us the way to the noblest and best that we can do to others. The "men," therefore, in the first and second clauses of the golden rule laid down by Jesus are not to be regarded as *identical*; if they were, any thought of a wise maxim of reciprocal treatment would be excluded. Further, the morality of pure utilitarianism is directly repudiated in Matthew v. 46 and Luke xiv. 12-14. Rather is Jesus' love for the brethren a solicitous care especially for those who are called "little ones."[1] It is akin to the humility that is ever ready to minister to others.[2] It is still, therefore, fitted to help us even at the present time to bridge over social distinctions.

But it is possible to love one's enemy only if one is

[1] Mark ix. 42 = Luke xvii. 2 = Matthew xviii. 6; cp. Matthew xxv. 40; x. 42.

[2] Mark x. 43 f. = Matthew xx. 26 f. = Luke xxii. 26 f.; Matthew xxiii. 12 = Luke xiv. 11; xviii. 14.

prepared to fulfil the duty of forgiveness, which in turn has its rise in the desire for Divine forgiveness. This thought carries us back once more to the parable of the unjust servant (p. 98). On another occasion Peter is warned by his Master that men ought to forgive unto seventy times seven, that is to say, again and again without end (Matthew xviii. 21 f. = Luke xvii. 3 f). And with forgiveness is associated the generous peaceableness and placability which come before us in Matthew v. 23-26; and the abjuring of all censorious fault finding (Matthew vii. 1-5 = Luke vi. 37-42). For, as Socrates also says, according to Plato, it is better to suffer wrong than to do wrong. Jesus, in true Oriental style, lays an intentional and exaggerated stress on this precept, in order to contrast it with the Jewish principle of retaliation which had converted a grim rule, intended only for the judge, into a law binding upon every private individual—the rule which runs (Exod. xxi. 24 f.), "Life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burning for burning, wound for wound, stripe for stripe."[1] We allude to His strange words about a blow on the cheek, about cloak and mantle, and about the voluntary doubling of a forced journey, in Matthew v. 38-41 (= Luke vi. 29). Present-day moralists often show some fondness for jesting at the Christianity which such sayings are supposed to reveal. They forget that here the patience displayed is self-mastery in all its strength. The sole aim of Jesus is to teach with the utmost insistence that evil is made good not by evil, but by a goodness that is superior to it (cp. Rom. xii. 20). This is a truth which is quite unassailable.

4. *The Religion of Action.*—If in these different ways

[1] [Ex. xxi. 24 f. Cp. the oldest code of laws—the Hammurabi Code.]

men display a frame of mind well-pleasing to God, the result must necessarily be seen in words and deeds, just as the good tree bears good fruit (Matthew vii. 16-20 and xii. 33-35 = Luke vi. 43-45). If the eye, that is to say the frame of mind, has light, it makes the whole body full of light (Matthew vi. 22 f. = Luke xi. 34-36). Unless the frame of mind is right, action is of no value. It becomes pharisaical. If the frame of mind is right, it must become operative and effective (Matthew vii. 21). Its outcome is "righteousness," that is to say "rightness." Jesus also, therefore, requires righteousness, just as John the Baptist had required it shortly before Him (Matthew xxi. 32), and just as the party of the Pharisees, too (pp. 37 ff.), had long held it to be possible. The idea is expressed in His great saying (Matthew v. 48): "Ye must be perfect, as your Father in heaven is perfect."[1] While, however, the Pharisees required an external fulfilment of the *whole* Law, which in truth was exorbitant, the Master, whose nature was mild like that of the prophets, fixed His thought only on the good walk of one who in principle has accepted the will of God as his standard of conduct broadly speaking, and on the whole acts in conformity with it. In this sense He calls His followers "righteous."[2] God's mercy will repair any shortcoming in the ideal, bestowing happiness as a reward, but at the same time also as a free gift.[3] This new righteousness, born of religious feeling, Jesus, speaking with the Divine authority of a prophet ("But I say to you," Matthew v. 20-48 f.), contrasts with the righteousness of "those of ancient time." By its

[1] Cp. Matthew vii. 21; vi. 33; vi. 1; v. 10; v. 6.
[2] Matthew x. 41; xiii. 43, 49; xxv. 37, 46; v. 45.
[3] Luke xviii. 13 f.; Matthew xiii. 44-46; Matthew v. 8; xx. 15.

means He threw a new light on the ten commandments of the Old Testament,[1] in order to fulfil them, in other words, to deepen and spiritualise them. At the same time He did not by any means fail to realise that a righteous man must at all points combine the prudence of the serpent with the harmlessness of the dove (Matthew x. 16). The parables dealing with the preparations for building a tower and for making war inculcate a prudence that calculates all the ways and means (Luke xiv. 28-32). The ideal way in which Jesus interpreted moral problems is exemplified particularly in His ideas on divorce and the oath.

As to divorce, the accounts of the Gospels are simply at variance.[2] A strict (Mark and Luke) and a laxer (Matthew) view are found abruptly side by side. The latter recognises adultery to be a ground for separation; the former absolutely rejects the idea of separation and remarriage. Which of the two views represents the view of Jesus himself? The strictest and most ideal requirement, we may be sure. Viewed as a whole, Jesus' commands embody the highest ideals. His was certainly a nature to which everything of the nature of compromise was foreign. The early testimony of Paul agrees remarkably well with this judgment. In 1 Cor. vii. 10 f. he writes: "The married pair I command, yea not I, but the Lord, that the wife depart not from her husband; if she depart, she ought to remain unmarried, or else be reconciled to her husband; likewise the husband ought not to leave his wife" (cp. Rom. vii. 2 f.). Yet even without this evidence it might be contended that as Christianity

[1] Mark x. 19 = Luke xviii. 20 = Matthew xix. 18 f.; Matthew v. 21 f., 27 f., 33-37; Mark vii. 9-13 = Matthew xv. 3-6.

[2] Mark x. 9, 11; Matthew xix. 9; v. 32; Luke xvi. 18.

developed, strictness would be gradually relaxed, not *vice versa.*

Similarly, it is very probable that Jesus rejected the oath altogether (Matthew v. 34, 37): "But I say unto you, Ye ought not to swear at all. Let your speech be Yea, Yea; Nay, Nay; whatsoever goes beyond this is of the evil one." It is very interesting to note that this saying seems to have been preserved in its earliest form in the Epistle of James (v. 12). The form is the same as that given by the earliest Fathers also: "Let your Yea be a (mere) Yea, and your Nay a (mere) Nay"; the oath is forbidden altogether. Moreover, Jesus speaks in severe terms of the frivolous and jesuitical use of oaths by the Pharisees and their quibbling lawyers (Matthew xxiii. 16-22), assailing the artifices by which they explained one oath as valid, another as invalid. Of these controversial utterances fragments of all kinds were at a later date introduced into Matthew (v. 34*b*-36) in a wrong connection, with the result that the impression was conveyed that Jesus allowed the oath by God and only rejected the use of the oath for trivial occasions. The Epistle of James, too, is acquainted with the Gospel statement of the case, but saves the original meaning. Paul had already lost the original idea of Jesus.[1] The fact that Jesus himself, when brought before the high priest, swore by using the oath-formula, "Thou hast said it" (Matthew xxvi. 63 f.), is no argument against this conclusion, for He was compelled to use the oath only by force of circumstances (cp. p. 157 f.).

All the moral and religious maxims of Jesus, as given in the Gospels, are pervaded by a solemn seriousness, and there is in them no trace at all of the feebleness which has

[1] Rom. i. 9; 2 Cor. i. 23; xi. 31; Gal. i. 20; Phil. i. 8.

overtaken Christianity in the course of its development. And the present age is particularly attracted by this vigorous manliness. Jesus has given expression to this strenuousness in a comprehensive way in those words of His, "Ye are the salt of the earth," etc. (Matthew v. 13-16). The words were addressed, not to the twelve alone, but to all disciples.

5. *Final Outlook.*—So far the thought of the "kingdom of God" has been quite in the background in Jesus' teaching. The saying of a leading modern theologian (Harnack) finds confirmation on all hands and is inherently true: "God and the soul, the soul and its God," constituted the real kernel of Jesus' preaching. It was chiefly the individual, with all his religious and moral problems, that interested Him, and His preaching thereon occupied a large space in His public ministry. For a period at first He regarded himself simply as a prophetic reformer of the religion that had been handed down. Of course at all times He thought of the whole aggregate of human souls who were in unison with God, as constituting the kingdom of God. And naturally when He spoke of this kingdom, He had in mind a community of people under perfect conditions—the peace of God and happiness. But, just as His religious and moral precepts were loyally followed, the kingdom must gradually, but inevitably,[1] in time become an accomplished fact. As with John the Baptist, the end of the world lay in His horizon; it was this that gave His precepts, even from the beginning, their practical

[1] In illustration of this we are tempted to refer to the parables of the mustard-seed and the leaven (Matthew xiii. 31-33 = Luke xiii. 18-21 = Mark iv. 30-32). The development from within, from internal resources, is, however, quite a modern idea. The Master simply contrasted great results with small beginnings.

seriousness; the Divine co-operation towards the coming of the kingdom was always necessary. The prophetical writings, it is true, already contained deeply-rooted eschatological ideas.

It was not till a later date, however, when opposition arose and "the Galilean Spring" was past, that the thought came more and more into the foreground with Him, that the completion of this kingdom was about to arrive, and that God would at last inaugurate it on a sudden. We shall illustrate in detail this development of ideas and the conception of the kingdom of God in our next chapter (pp. 126 f.). It is enough to point out here that now for the first time His words began more and more to look towards the future and even towards the final consummation of all things. "The emphasising of the near approach of the end of the world" now became a force that impelled to earnest, redoubled effort after self-ennoblement or holiness in the sight of God. Without such thoughts of the future, we cannot well understand the figures of the narrow and wide gates to the kingdom of heaven (Matthew vii. 13 f.; cp. Luke xiii. 24), of the houses built upon rock and sand,[1] of the watching of the servants (Mark xiii. 35-37), of the entrusted talents,[2] of the treasure in the field and of the pearl (Matthew xiii. 44-46), as also such sayings as Matthew x. 28 = Luke xii. 4 f. We might, nevertheless, be tempted to assign them all a place amongst the purely religious and moral ideas in the preaching of Jesus which must be regarded as best preserved and most firmly established, if we felt obliged to regard all the ideas about the

[1] Matthew vii. 24-27 = Luke vi. 47-49.
[2] Matthew xxv. 14-30 = Luke xix. 12-27; cp. p. 114.

Messiahship of Jesus as later developments within the Church.

All such passages as are undoubtedly influenced by this contemplation of the end of the world will, as already indicated, be discussed in the next chapter.

6. *Conclusion.*—It must be expressly understood that the preceding observations on Jesus' preaching proceed upon broad grounds of principle merely. And that, firstly, because only in very rare cases do we know the precise occasion and particular period of Jesus' sayings (pp. 80 ff.); secondly, because we have no express and detailed teaching of Jesus to give. Of necessity they can only be of a summary character. Nevertheless, we know very well that Jesus had no system and propounded no system; we have clearly described His style of teaching (pp. 76 ff., above). He was neither a philosopher nor a dogmatist. Nor, again, did His teaching take the form of miscellaneous detached proverbs, though indeed our tradition suggests that His style is "aphoristic." Underlying all His sayings there is the one general idea of an exemplary and creative piety. It is this possibility of gaining a general view of His teaching that supplies a valuable key to the historical truth. At the same time, if we wish to reconcile many seeming contradictions we must not forget that Jesus himself developed. Of this fact we shall shortly give clearer illustrations.

CHAPTER XII

JESUS' ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE JEWISH NATION

1. *The Jewish Horizon.*—We feel Jesus' connection with the people of Israel to have been something essential, not a mere accident. He must, therefore, almost as a matter of course, we see, have been deeply absorbed in His mission to His own people (on "the twelve" apostles, cp. p. 91 f.), and could never have quite despaired. As we know, He continually and in a great variety of ways linked His teaching with that of the Israelite prophets. These, too, whenever they spoke of the coming salvation confined themselves strictly within the limits of their own people, though it is true that when their message rose to its highest (*e.g.* Isaiah ii. 1-4; Micah iv. 1-4) they always at the same time thought of the Gentiles as being received and adopted into the Israelite community. This gave to their teaching, notwithstanding its nationalism, a world-wide character. We must suppose the attitude of the Master of Nazareth to have been very similar, though in His conception of God the Father, and in the ideas of heart-purity, of love, and of active service associated with it, there was involved a tendency towards the universalism that embraces the whole human race, infinitely more

powerful still than in the case of the prophets. It was reserved for Paul, the great Apostle of the Gentiles, to unfold and systematically develop this tendency.[1] Jesus can never have taught with unmistakable clearness the equality of all peoples in the sight of God; had He done so, it would be impossible to understand the existence amongst early Christians of a party that attached itself with narrow-minded strictness to the Jewish Law.[2] An express command of the Founder could not have been treated with such disrespect. In justice to Jesus, however, we must always remember how brief was the period of His activity. Who can tell how sublimely His thoughts might have developed if His work had not been so abruptly cut short at the behest of His Father?

The matter under consideration has been very much obscured in the Gospels. Sayings which have the strictest application to Israel alone are found in close connection with utterances of the widest possible scope.[3] On a closer examination, those passages which refer in so friendly a way to the Gentiles (cited above) are seen to be later insertions or even adaptations of the words of Jesus. What is known as the baptismal precept (Matthew xxviii. 18 f.), for instance, "Go and make disciples of all peoples, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," and so forth, as being a

[1] The Pauline transformation of Christianity is thus already presupposed in the Gospel of John, in such words, for instance, as those of x. 16, "There will be one flock, one shepherd," or of xii. 20 f.; iv. 21. At the same time this Gospel has entered more deeply than any other into the spirit of Jesus.

[2] Gal. ii. 11 f., and even more strongly Acts xv. 5.

[3] Matthew xv. 24; xix. 28; x. 5 f., as compared with Matthew viii. 11 f.; xxiv. 14*a* [=Mark xiii. 10]; xxviii. 19 [Mark xvi. 15 f.].

saying of "the exalted Christ" and containing the doctrine of the Trinity,[1] must be regarded as being of very late origin, quite apart from the fact that the original apostles considered their mission to be to the Jews only (Gal. ii. 9).

In the Gospel of Luke the Gentile-Christian leanings of the author are unmistakable. He wishes to bring Jesus into contact with non-Jews; this is shown most clearly in the account he gives of a journey through the half-Gentile Samaria (ix. 51–xviii. 14), concerning which the other Evangelists have no information.[2] On this journey, out of ten lepers who have been healed one alone, a "stranger," gives glory to God (Luke xvii. 11-19). It is in the same narrative that we hear of the seventy disciples (p. 93).

We find, however, that even the parable-discourses of Jesus, which form so important a part of the Gospel literature, have not unfrequently been edited in a Gentile-Christian interest. The parable of the talents (or pounds) of Matthew xxv. 14-30 has been very much altered in Luke xix. 11-27. Verses 12*b*, 14, 15, and 27 are here foreign elements; the idea being to show that Jesus Christ must first gain a far-away kingdom among the Gentiles. The colours of the story are taken from a journey to Rome of Archelaus, who, on the death of his father, Herod the Great, obtained confirmation in part of the dominion of Herod from the Emperor (p. 25 f.). The original meaning of the parable concerning the varying

[1] As regards the baptismal formula, the Church historian Eusebius, writing at the beginning of the fourth century, has preserved a simpler text.

[2] As to the value of the fragments of traditional teaching embodied here, no judgment of course is here implied.

endowments of the messengers who went forth to preach the doctrine of Jesus was a purely moral and religious one: Let every one seek to increase his religious possessions ("put them out at interest").

In the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, in the form in which we have it, since the rich man and his brethren, who have Moses and the Prophets, represent the Jews, Lazarus must be meant to represent the Gentiles (Luke xvi. 19-31). But if, as seems probable, the parable originally ended at *v.* 26, Jesus was simply drawing out the contrast between a pious poor man amongst the people of Israel and a hard-hearted man of wealth.

Similarly, we must suppose that the parables of the royal feast (Matthew xxii. 1-10 = Luke xiv. 15-24) and of the prodigal son in their original form related only to Jewish conditions. In the former, Matthew gives two classes of guests only, Luke three. But both relate to the rejection of the Jews. Jesus himself, doubtless, had but two classes of people in mind. He contrasted the attitude of the leaders of the people with that of the petty folk. On the second parable, cp. p. 99. Here, originally, the elder son represented the Pharisees, the younger the publicans and sinners, in whom, notwithstanding their shortcomings, there was latent promise of amendment. In the parable of the wicked vine-dressers[1] a contrast is again drawn (according to Mark xii. 12 = Luke xx. 19, and even according to Matthew xxi. 45) simply between the heads of the Jewish people and the masses. In Matthew xxi. 43 alone the explanation is altered so as to refer to the choice of the Gentiles.

If we keep the later interpretations separate and confine

[1] Mark xii. 1-12 = Matthew xxi. 33-44 = Luke xx. 9-19.

our attention to the unedited accounts and passages, we continually find that the Master held firmly to His Jewish outlook. Matthew xi. 25 f. = Luke x. 21 f. deals simply with a contrast between "wise and prudent" (the scribes of the Pharisees) on the one hand, and "babes" (the quiet in the land) on the other. The parable of the two different sons (Matthew xxi. 28-32) contrasts Pharisees and scribes with publicans and harlots. The same antithesis is quite obvious in the parables of the publican and Pharisee in the temple (Luke xviii. 9-14), of the lost sheep, and of the lost piece of money (Luke xv. 1-10 = Matthew xviii. 12-14). In that of the workers in the vineyard, again (Matthew xx. 1-16), since there are five classes of persons, we have to do simply with a diversity of religious character among the Jews.

Naturally Jesus was acquainted with Gentiles and sometimes spoke of them. But when He did so, we find that it was always in alluding to historical events of a previous age,[1] or that His view was limited to the immediate neighbourhood only.[2]

His relationship to the Gentiles is even now, however, clearly discernible in the episode of the Syrophœnician woman (Matthew xv. 21-28 = Mark vii. 24-30). The story shows in the most valuable way the progress of Jesus' inner development. Moved by the urgently repeated, though moderate request of the woman, the Master who at first would confine His work to the Jews alone, is induced to extend His love to a Gentile as well.

[1] Matthew xi. 24 = Luke x. 12, Sodom; Matthew xii. 41 f. = Luke xi. 30-31, Nineveh and Sheba.

[2] Matthew xi. 21 f. = Luke x. 13 f., Tyre and Sidon; Luke x. 33, Samaria.

What a lasting impression this dialogue on a foreign soil must have made on Him! But naturally the encounter with a "Gentile" officer of the reigning prince, Herod Antipas, cannot have preceded this incident and fallen out as Matthew viii. 5-13 = Luke vii. 1-10 (cp. xiii. 28-30), quite in the Pauline spirit, would have us believe. That under pressure of bitter experiences at the hands of His own people, Jesus' mind, like those of the prophets, should have broadened and become sympathetic towards the Gentiles is only what might have been expected.

2. *Validity of the Mosaic Law.*—Jesus' attitude towards the religion of His fathers is clearly shown in His struggle with the Pharisees.[1] This struggle has a history of its own; in the course of it the Master developed as a controversialist.

In the first stage of this development He was the reformer who aimed simply, like John the Baptist (Matthew v. 17), at giving to the Law a deeper and more spiritual meaning. As against a worship of the letter, He desired a religion of the mind and heart.[2] Next, in the second stage, joining hands with the prophets of former times, He brought into the foreground the moral requirements of the Law and relegated to a subordinate place the sacrificial system and temple worship.[3] In doing so, however, He did not abolish them altogether.[4] In the last stage He went on to commit actual breaches of the Law, at first unconsciously (Mark ii. 15 f.; vii. 24), but in

[1] Matthew xxiii. 1-33 = Luke xx. 45-47; xi. 37-52 = Mark xii. 38-40; cp. pp. 37 ff.

[2] Mark vii. 1-15; Matthew v. 21 f., 27, 29; vi. 16-18.

[3] Mark xii. 33; Matthew xxiii. 23 f. = Luke xi. 42; Matthew xii. 7; ix. 13.

[4] Matthew v. 23 f.; Luke iv. 16; Mark xiv. 12, 22, 26.

the end deliberately. In this stage, fasting is found to be no longer in harmony with the joyful notes of His teaching. The Messianic age is like a marriage-feast.[1] The external worship in the temple is too narrow for Him.[2] For Him the Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath (Mark ii. 27), nay, what is more, the Son of man is unfettered Lord of the Sabbath.[3] This is why He disturbs the deathlike rest of the Jewish holy day. He permits all work of pressing necessity,[4] and all such deeds as are pleasing to God.[5] Similarly, the commands as to ceremonial purity, the laws as to food, and many kindred doctrines prevalent amongst the Jews, have now become repugnant to Him.[6] At each of these stages of His rejection of the requirements of the Law, we may be sure that it was the Pharisees—their externalism, their persistent trend towards literal observance of the letter, and the hypocrisy and hollow show which this brought in its train—that convinced Him that it was impossible to accept in all points the ancient Law, unless He were to sacrifice His most precious and hardly-won possession—inner peace and piety of heart. We may be sure that the struggle which it cost Him ere He could give up, bit by bit, that which from His early youth He had been accustomed to regard as the inviolable will of God, was not an easy one.

[1] Mark ii. 18-20 = Matthew ix. 14 f. = Luke v. 33-35; cp. Matthew xi. 18 f. = Luke vii. 33 f.

[2] Mark ii. 25 f. = Matthew xii. 3-6 = Luke vi. 3 f.; Mark xiv. 58 = Matthew xxvi. 61; Matthew xvii. 25 f.

[3] Matthew xii. 8 = Luke vi. 5 = Mark ii. 28.

[4] Luke xiv. 1-6; xiii. 10-17; Matthew xii. 10 f.; Mark ii. 25 f.

[5] Mark iii. 4 = Luke vi. 9 = Matthew xii. 12; xii. 5.

[6] Mark ii. 15 f. = Matthew ix. 10 f. = Luke v. 29 f.; Mark vii. 18-23 = Matthew xv. 16, 20.

In all this polemic, therefore, about the Mosaic Law, Jesus by preference takes His stand upon other utterances in the sacred books, fuller of spiritual import.[1] It is by them that His own religious consciousness has been shaped. Once He had definitely recognised His Messianic calling, His new religious legislation acquired double power. Jesus, however, had no wish completely to abrogate the Law of Moses; or at least His life was too short to permit of His coming to any clear and decisive conclusion on the subject (pp. 144 f.). Otherwise the existence amongst His followers of a strictly Jewish-Christian party would be incomprehensible. Moreover, it was Paul who first, working along another road, came to declare that the Jewish Law, being impossible of fulfilment, was null and void. All the same, Jesus the thinker stands high above Paul the systematiser in creative greatness.

In truth, expressions are by no means entirely wanting in which we find Jesus rejecting the old religion with great thoroughness, only that in His lifetime they failed to translate themselves into practice. Such expressions will most naturally be assigned to the latest period of His activity. Take, for instance, the metaphors of the new patch on an old garment, and of new wine in old skins,[2] perhaps also the saying about the new temple (Mark xiv. 58 = Matthew xxvi. 61). In these He absolutely breaks away from Judaism. With such sayings it is impossible to reconcile the words in Matthew v. 18 f. about the sanctity and permanent worth of each jot and tittle of the Law, even if we regard them as spoken at an earlier stage in the development of His teaching. We are obliged to

[1] Mark ii. 25 f.; x. 2-9 = Matthew xix. 7 f.; xii. 7; Mark xi. 17.
[2] Mark ii. 21 f. = Matthew ix. 16 f. = Luke v. 36-38.

regard them as a late insertion by a Jewish-Christian hand, unless it be that the words may be taken as referring to the new law of Jesus, of which reference, however, no trace is now found in the text. We might, indeed, be tempted to take our stand on Luke xvi. 16-18, where an old text has preserved this meaning. In that case, the words would also harmonise with Matthew xxiv. 35, which contains that great and inspiring word: "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away."

3. *The Idea of Messiahship.*—The next question—Did the Master ever come to regard himself as the Messiah expected by the Jews?—brings us to what is at present the most debated point in the life of Jesus. Only a thorough investigation of the Messianic ideal current among the Jews will prepare the way for a satisfactory answer. As is well known, the Hebrew *Māshiah* and the Aramaic *Meshīha*, from which the Greek form Messiah is derived, mean "the anointed one"; it is very familiar to us in the Greek title, Christ (John i. 41).[1] The Old Testament mentions, as anointed ones, kings, prophets, high priests, the whole nation of Israel, and even "Wisdom" personified. Strangely enough, He who in the New Testament is called the Messiah, the inaugurator of the kingdom of blessedness at the end of the world, is not so designated in the Old Testament. The application of the name to this person seems to have been due to a misunderstanding of two passages in the Old Testament—Psalm ii. 2 and Dan. ix. 26. The first contains in reality only a quite general reference to a king who (*v.* 9) is to dash the people in pieces, like potters' vessels, with a rod of iron; the second, dating from 167 to 164 B.C., alludes to something that happened in 171

[1] See article "Messiah" in *Encyclopædia Biblica*.

B.C., the killing of the last legitimate high priest, Onias III., the descendant of Zadok (1 Kings ii. 35; 1 Chron. v. 27-34).[1]

The hope that some individual Messianic ruler would appear is by no means very greatly in evidence in the Old Testament.[2] What are known as the Messianic hopes resolve themselves for the most part into expressions of the general aspiration of men saddened by a hard and comfortless present after a golden age in the future. In uttering these hopes Malachi and other prophets[3] speak only of the coming of the glory of Yahwè.

In the last centuries before Jesus of Nazareth, to be sure, the thought of the Messiah became an active, living force. The hope of a God-sent hero of the people was fostered and encouraged in a very special manner by the words in Dan. vii. 13, "And behold there cometh upon the clouds of heaven one like a Son of man" (*i.e.* in the form of man). What, in point of fact, Daniel is really thinking of, if we consider vii. 18, 22, 25, 27, is simply the entire people of Israel in its glorified renovation. Over and above this central passage there is a great variety of testimony, dating from the years 140 to 40 B.C., to the existence of this Messianic hope; for the most part these passages are included in the "Apocalyptic writings"—a class of literature we have already had occasion to mention (p. 58 f.: parts of the Sibylline Oracles, Psalms of Solomon, Parable-discourses in the Book of Enoch, sayings of Philo the philosopher).[4] In many ways this longing for a Divine

[1] The person described in *v.* 25 as an anointed prince is actually a definite ruler of a foreign country, Cyrus the Persian (538 B.C.; cp. Isaiah xlv. 1-5).

[2] Isaiah ix. 1-6; xi. 1-10; Micah v. 1; Zech. iii. 8; vi. 9-15; ix. 9.

[3] Isaiah xl.-lxvi.; Zeph. iii. 9-20; Joel iii.

[4] See article "Apocalyptic Literature" in *Encyclopædia Biblica.*

hero finds expression in the New Testament itself. In Matthew xi. 3 = Luke vii. 19, for instance, the disciples of John ask Jesus, "Art thou he that should come?" In Mark viii. 28 f. = Matthew xvi. 13-16 = Luke ix. 18-20, the band of disciples, particularly Peter their spokesman, is clearly acquainted with the idea of the Messiah then current. According to Mark xi. 1-10 = Matthew xxi. 1-9 = Luke xix. 28-40 (cp. John xii. 12-19) Jesus assumed the Messiahship when He made His entry into Jerusalem.

Cherishing this hope, as we have seen, the people gave it very various forms. At one time they spoke in a quite general way of some "prophet" who was to appear, by this not meaning as yet the real Messiah. At another time the expected One is the prophet foretold by Moses, who was to equal Him in greatness, or He is Jeremiah or Elijah risen again. Sometimes He is called "the Anointed" merely, sometimes "the Son of man,"[1] sometimes "the Son of God,"[1] sometimes "the son of David," sometimes "the holy King," and so forth,[2]—all of them names which we shall meet with again. His chief attributes are wisdom and power. But whatever form it takes, the Messianic idea is a product of the national sentiment of the Jews. It embodies the popular aspiration after a glorious renewal of the monarchy. Israel, a great power such as it was under king David—this was ever the goal of their ambitions. We instinctively recall the German legend of Barbarossa. The sons of David were the

[1] See articles "Son of Man" and "Son of God" in *Encyclopædia Biblica*.

[2] Mark ix. 11; vi. 15; viii. 28; Malachi iii. 23; Deut. xviii. 15-18 ["prophet" is here collective]; Acts iii. 22; vii. 37; John i. 21, 25; vi. 14; vii. 40; Luke vii. 16; xxiv. 19 [xxiv. 24]; John i. 46; v. 46; iv. 25; Matthew xvii. 5; xxi. 9; xvi. 14; Apocalypses of the first century A.D.

Hohenstaufen or Hohenzollern of the Jews. What are the characteristic features in this hope of a golden future? In a decisive battle the Divine hero is to overthrow the multitudes of the nations who rage against Him. A new Jerusalem will arise. The Jews will return home from the dispersion. Then will follow the final drama in three acts —death, resurrection, and judgment. It is interesting to note that the Messiah cannot appear until the people have become pure. Here we have the reason for the coming of John the Baptist; and this moral ingredient is the only thing that could make the idea acceptable to Jesus.

Did He accept it or not? What is certain at the outset is only this, that to the great question primitive Christians gave the unanimous answer: Jesus was the Christ. It was this confession, and this alone, that marked them off from the Jews; it was this that gave birth to the new sect. But at the present day it is often doubted whether this belief of the early Christians had its root in the belief of Jesus himself. It is suggested that in the early days the Messiahship of Jesus may have been deduced simply from His resurrection, and that the idea came to be transferred to His lifetime only at a later date. If this be so, even the narrative of Mark would have been suggested by a scheme which was at variance with the real course of history. Critics who think in this way, accordingly, represent Jesus as keeping His title to the Messiahship "secret," so that down to the time of His death (*e.g.* Mark ix. 19, 32) the disciples are presented to us as "unknowing fools." On the occasion when, after Peter has done homage to Jesus as the Messiah (Mark viii. 29-31), the Master answers with warning words about suffering, He is held to have rejected the title. Further, when Jesus speaks, not

in the first person as "I," but in the third as "the Son of man," He is held to have spoken of the Messianic future as one who was destined to have no part in it.

All these so-called proofs against the view that Jesus considered himself to be the Messiah are inconclusive. The methods of those who deny Jesus' Messianic claim are as violent as they are ingenious and seemingly convincing. If Jesus was simply a revolutionary Rabbi, how could He have inaugurated an activity so powerful, or have created a regard for His own person so special, that His death, as a malefactor, so far from destroying it, increased it? How, in spite of His fatal ending, could people have believed in His resurrection? There can be no doubt whatever that the disciples put the question to the Master, Art thou the Messiah? At the time in which it is said to have been put, it was (so to say) in the air. If He had said that He was not—and His denial must have been absolute—the early Church could never again have applied the title to Him. This consideration gives great significance to Peter's confession at Cæsarea Philippi, to the entry into Jerusalem when Jesus of set purpose carried out the Messianic prophecy in Zech. ix. 9 (p. 122), to His oath before the high priest (Matthew xxvi. 63 f.), and to the superscription on the Roman cross.[1] They appear as firm landmarks which cannot be overpassed.

Why should it be impossible to account for Jesus' counsel of secrecy when He worked cures and on other occasions, even if He believed himself to be the Messiah? We have only to bear in mind that here again Jesus underwent a development, that the idea that He was the Messiah also dawned upon Him only by degrees. He

[1] Mark xv. 26 = Matthew xxvii. 37 = Luke xxiii. 38.

felt himself to be bound to God by the closest links of love, and so to be the "Son of God" in a religious and moral sense (p. 62 f.). To Him has been entrusted the whole truth of God (Matthew xi. 27 = Luke x. 22). When He first made His appearance He followed in the footsteps of John, and was simply a moral and religious reformer.[1] His antagonists were the Pharisees. Next there grew up in Him the conviction that He had a very special Divine mission. He was conscious of the higher authority. That He hesitated and hid the truth is henceforth explained by the fact that He first needed to succeed as a preacher and healer, and must first clear away the popular idea that the Divine hero would lead a political party and take warlike and violent action, before He could apply the Messianic idea to himself (story of the temptation, p. 66 f.).[2] At first He prayed, and then experienced the thoughts and feelings of a Cassandra.

Little that is positive, but much that is negative, can be said as to the date at which He became convinced that in His Divine fervour lay the authority of a prophet, and regarded himself as the Messiah. After what we have already said (especially as regards the Virgin-birth, p. 49 f.) it seems impossible to suppose that the conviction that He was the Messiah was inborn. To affirm this would be to quit the domain of what is humanly conceivable. Also His quiet growth and His baptism are insufficient to account for the origin of such an idea (pp. 61 ff.). It can only have sprung up in the light of great publicity. On the other hand, also, it must be said, the

[1] As in the case of John, we are not prevented from thinking that His ideas received an apocryphal tinge.

[2] Cp. Oscar Holtzmann's *Life of Jesus*, p. 151.

disciples can hardly have been the first to suggest the idea. For, since at Cæsarea Philippi He invites their opinion, He must himself already have been considering what His true character was. At all points He made them sharers in His world of thoughts. Indeed, until now, He had not given them the slightest occasion for spontaneously associating their Jewish ideal of the Messiah with His own person. On all the suggested assumptions, therefore, the psychological motives, on which everything depends, would be missing. Unless we would abandon all attempts to explain the matter, as most recent critics do, we must look for the rise of this sublime self-consciousness at a period between the baptism and Peter's confession. The prominence previously given to the purely religious and moral preaching in the life of Jesus then receives an excellent explanation. We can then, and then alone, realise how it was that Jesus could believe in the practical coming of the "kingdom of God" as the result of obedience to religious and moral commands (p. 109 f.).

The idea of a "kingdom of heaven" is in substance taken certainly from Dan. ii. 44; vii. 18, 27. Since, however, the expression "kingdom of heaven" occurs only in the Gospel according to Matthew, it must remain a question whether Jesus himself made use of it. Jesus, it is probable, spoke only of the "kingdom of God" (Matthew xii. 28). In many religions and languages, it is true, "God" and "Heaven" are interchangeable terms (cp. *e.g.* Luke xv. 18, 21) as in German and in English. Perhaps the expression was used in a sense in which God was thought of as "the Father in the heavens."[1]

[1] Heaven in Hebrew embraces a number of regions, usually seven (cp. also 2 Cor. xii. 2).

But whatever the true explanation of the names may be, Jesus was firmly persuaded that in some measure "the kingdom" was already present (cp. the unquestionably genuine words of Jesus in Matthew xii. 28; xxi. 31; xi. 11; Mark x. 15). The words in Luke xvii. 20 f. about the unobserved coming of the kingdom of God, and especially the clause, "For behold the kingdom of God is among you,"[1] would agree with this view. To Jesus and the people of His age, the opposite of the kingdom of God was the kingdom of Satan. This latter also was secretly present; its king, Beelzebub, the wicked enemy, Satan or the devil, and its spirits (the demons, adversaries of the angels) were actually ensnaring men.[2] We may reasonably suppose, therefore, that Jesus at first thought the kingdom of God would become a reality if people simply followed out His teaching. In this, too, there lies the hope, of course, that the end will come speedily. The hope was inspired by John the Baptist. It was not accidentally omitted, but was purposely included. At this early period stress is laid on the moral conditions bound up with the hope of the kingdom of God, quite in the style of the great prophets of former days, though here the unparalleled ardour of Jesus is specially emphasised. Later on, as the opposition waxed fiercer and fiercer, Jesus fixed His gaze more and more steadfastly on the future, and counted upon the miraculous interference of God. God must lead His Messiah to victory.

[1] The rendering "is within you" would give a very fine sense from a modern point of view, but will not hold, as the persons addressed are hostile Pharisees.

[2] Mark iii. 22-27 = Matthew xii. 22-29 = Luke xi. 14-22; Mark iv. 15 = Matthew xiii. 19 = Luke viii. 12; Luke x. 18; xiii. 16. Cp. pp. 82 f. and 85.

Schmiedel has recently made the brilliant and illuminative suggestion that the story of the transfiguration ought to be taken as reflecting the great crisis at which Jesus became convinced that He was the chosen hero of God. While explaining the matter in this way, we must not ignore the legendary supra-terrestrial light in which the Master is brought into contrast with Moses and Elijah, the representatives of the ancient religion.[1] Here we see the halo of the artist actually in process of formation. From this point onwards Jesus may be supposed to have called himself the "Son of man" (after Dan. vii. 13), choosing still for the most part the most modest Messianic title. Writers at a later date began to prefer more ambitious names. Jesus himself liked a name[2] which could be interpreted equally well to mean a mere child of man, which He had hitherto held himself to be. It was thus in the momentous moment at Cæsarea Philippi, that His disciples were allowed for the first time to divine His inmost feelings. But while the crowd was present He still wished the secret to be preserved.

When He took up the Messianic ideal of His people, Jesus no doubt transformed it in His own way. We saw this when we examined the story of the temptation (p. 66 f.). The manner in which He made His entry into Jerusalem will make this clearer still: "The Son of man is not come

[1] Mark ix. 2-13=Matthew xvii. 1-13=Luke ix. 28-36; cp. John xii. 28-30.

[2] We grant that the Evangelists, and Matthew in particular, especially as regards the first period of His life, used this circumlocution more commonly than Jesus himself used it. There are clear signs of adaptation to a scheme. But we cannot deny Him the use of the phrase in all passages, or resolve it into a purely Oriental and poetic metaphor for "man" (*e.g.* Mark x. 42-45=Matthew xx. 25, 28; Mark xiv. 21, 41).

to be ministered to" (Mark x. 45 = Matthew xx. 28). The explanation of the 110th Psalm in the dispute with the Pharisees (Mark xii. 35, 37) seems to point the same way. The Psalm is not interpreted in its correct historical sense; but this is a detail.[1] Jesus would say, it seems, that the Messiah is beyond and above the king of the Davidic ideal. The saying, too, "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's" (Mark xii. 17) is of the same nature. Excluding its warlike features, Jesus definitely accepted the description of the Messiah current in His age, with all the attributes with which it had been invested. Naturally, when the sword and spear were laid aside, prominence was given inevitably to the idea of a religious and moral revival of the people.

In the meantime, however, Jesus was nevertheless obliged to cling also to the hope of a second coming from heaven. It was His sheet-anchor when He found the bark of life prematurely wrecked and finally sinking. At this point we would rather not enter into any discussion, since we of a new age can no longer breathe that atmosphere of miracles. It ought not to be denied that Jesus felt himself to be the Messiah merely on the vague idea that He cherished none of those ideas that sometimes oppress us and make His character difficult to understand. In the last resort, what again and again stirs our souls is the spiritual import, not the mere form, of His convictions. The form, characteristic of His age, was merely the earthen vessel that served to enclose the precious contents,

[1] The title, which is generally admitted to have been added at a later date, makes David the poet. The author, however, holds a position subordinate to the king, and expresses himself quite naturally when he says: "The Lord (that is to say, God) says to my Lord (that is to say, the king)."

making them accessible to the Jews, and imparting to the man Jesus of Nazareth trenchant power even after His death. It was not a common teacher (p. 124), but the Messiah alone who could make people believe that God would not allow Him to die, but would cause Him to return from heaven. Gentile Christians accepted this high estimate of the Master without further question, while rejecting the husk which was altogether foreign to them. We may confidently follow their example. Jesus' Messiahship is for us not an article of belief, but a historical fact.

THE ABRUPT CLOSE

(CHAPS. XIII.–XIX.)

"The Son of man is not come to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many."—MARK x. 45 = MATTHEW xx. 28.

CHAPTER XIII

THE JOURNEY TO THE CAPITAL

1. *The Motives and Route.*—After Jesus had ministered as a preacher and worker in Galilee, the land of His nativity, for a period of which we can only say that it must have lain between the years 28 (29) and 34 A.D. (pp. 70 f.), and that the marked successes which had attended His labours at first had gradually waned somewhat owing to the hostility of the emissaries of the Pharisees, He made up His mind shortly before the Passover festival, about April in one of the earlier thirties A.D., to make a decisive journey to Jerusalem. By this time the consciousness of Messiahship had not only been awakened within Him—it had grown into a firm assurance. Perhaps, too, the stir which He had made had already attracted the attention of the authorities. He wished, therefore, to bring the whole nation to the point of deciding whether they would

recognise Him to be the Messiah or not. Only in the city of the Temple could the pulse of the people as a whole be felt. "Recognition in this conflict or death!" was now His watchword. In like manner the great prophets of old had chosen festal seasons for decisive steps (*e.g.* Amos vii. 13; v.; Isaiah v.).

The twelve, and with them doubtless a little crowd of faithful men and women, accompanied Him with trembling hearts (Mark x. 32). On the same road, we may be sure, other Galilean pilgrims were also travelling. The route they followed, that usually taken by the Jews, wound along the eastern shore of the Jordan for about a three days' journey through Peræa (Mark x. 1 = Matthew xix. 1). Crossing the river, they would then reach Jericho, the city of palm-trees. Thence a short day's journey through the mountain desert would take them up to the holy city. Luke's representation, according to which they took the shorter route through Samaria, cannot be regarded as plausible (p. 114). Passing by the Mount of Olives and through the valley of Kidron they would enter the capital on the east side, and would see towering above it the Temple of Herod the Great, resplendent in white and gold.

2. *The Entry.*—There can be no question that in His manner of entry Jesus had planned a dramatic action which should bring home to the consciousness of every one His claim to be the Messiah, and at the same time announce a monarchy without arms or army.[1] He proceeded on the indications of the prophet Zechariah (ix. 9): "Rejoice, O daughter of Zion! Exult aloud, O daughter of Jerusalem! Behold, thy king cometh to thee. Just and victorious is

[1] Mark xi. 1-40 = Matthew xxi. 1-9 = Luke xix. 28-49.

He. Meekly he rides in upon an ass, and upon a colt, the foal of an ass."

He chose as the animal to ride upon, not the warlike horse, but an ass, exclusively associated with peaceful pursuits. That He may have sent to fetch the animal from one of the farms on the Mount of Olives is not only possible, but very likely, not however without some previous offer or agreement. The prophet in Oriental style, using the parallelism of Hebrew poetry, repeats himself; Matthew has not understood that only *one* thing is meant in the two clauses. Taking the words literally, he introduces two animals for riding purposes. Mark and Luke mention only one animal, but distinguish it by saying that it had never yet been ridden. The people of His company then throng round the rider and throw green branches in the path, exulting, and crying out: "Give victory to the Son of David! Blessed be he that cometh in the name of the Lord! Blessed be the coming kingdom of our father David! Give victory in the heights!" or using similar words of homage. Then the first group meeting other groups of people inspired them with the same feeling; for on the soil of Jerusalem the Messianic hope was ever ready to burst into flame, and probably Jesus was by this time not altogether unknown in Judæa (Matthew xxi. 11). We must not think, of course (notwithstanding Matthew xxi. 10), that the entry of the Galileans had literally stirred the whole town; for Jerusalem was at all seasons a busy centre, with a permanent population of about 150,000 inhabitants. But at festival seasons, when pilgrims came from far and near, it rose to the dimensions of a world-capital, sheltering a million souls. Very soon, it is true, this latest Messiah

was destined to kindle a spark which was to set the whole city aflame.

Thus opens the Master's Passion-week at Jerusalem (say, from 8 to 14 Nisan), concerning which we have more thorough and trustworthy details than about almost anything else in the life of Jesus, if only we know how to deal with all the Old Testament colouring which was introduced at a later date into the picture. It was natural that from the very first the thoughts of the Early Church should dwell chiefly upon the death of the Messiah.

CHAPTER XIV

THE DECISIVE STRUGGLE

1. *The Cleansing of the Temple.*—From the very beginning of Jesus' public life there was an undercurrent of hatred against Him because He came forward as a reformer. The more critical He became in His attitude towards the religion of His fathers, the fiercer grew the enmity of the Pharisees, the most powerful party in the nation. But it was His violent purging of the Temple, the national sanctuary, that really marked the beginning of the end.[1] This must have taken place on His very first visit. On this occasion, if He had already looked calmly at everything, as Mark xi. 11 says, as a novice who was visiting the city for the first time, then the subsequent cleansing of the Augean stable would have been the result of premeditation and deliberation. In truth, however, it must have been the outcome of the sudden outburst of indignation produced by the hubbub of the fair which He found in the outer court of the House of God. Here, during the preparations for the Passover festival, had been

[1] Mark xi. 15-18=Matthew xxi. 12 f.=Luke xix. 45, 46=John ii. 13-17.

set up the seats of the dealers in sacrificial beasts and spices, and of the money-changers who exchanged foreign coin for that required to pay the Temple dues, and a noisy bargaining and bartering was continually going on under the eyes of the Temple police. Any one who has seen a Roman Catholic pilgrimage-church when surrounded by its booths and stalls in the pilgrim-season can form a fairly correct idea of the scene in the Temple court. Jesus thought of the ancient prophets such as Hosea (vi. 6), Isaiah (i. 10-14), or Jeremiah (vii. 11; vi. 20), and remembered how the whole of this noisy preparation for sacrifice was an abomination to them. He then went on to teach, with a force greater than theirs, the new religion which springs from the inmost heart of man. In the cause of the prophets He would fain obtain possession of the Temple.[1] Filled as He was with a piety of the heart, He was deeply shocked by this sanctimonious commercialism, and taking advantage of the first gush of enthusiasm shown by the crowd that thronged around Him, His hands trembling with the noblest anger a man can feel, He drove away the rabble, one and all. His Messianic consciousness filled Him with a sense of full authority. The mass of the people, filled at first with the kind of awe and astonishment with which they had regarded John, the stern preacher of repentance, cried out. The priestly party, the Sadducees (p. 40 f.), snorting with rage, determined to be revenged; their revenues were threatened; their dignity had been affronted. Just at present, of course, they could do nothing; a crowd of people stood, like a wall, round the man of God.[2]

2. *War of Words.*—We can understand how at this

[1] Cp. Acts vi. 13 f.
[2] Mark xi. 18; xii. 37; Luke xix. 48.

particular juncture the power of prophetic utterance should have manifested itself in the words of Jesus flowing straight from His soul. Now it was that He struck the note which He maintained throughout the whole week in His warfare with the authorities. Day by day He appeared in the porticoes around the Temple buildings, and taught as others were accustomed to do. To some extent He was drawn on by opponents who asked Him puzzling questions, and were met and confounded with counter-questions. Such questions would be those as to His authority in purging the Temple,[1] as to the obligation to pay taxes,[2] as to the resurrection.[3] In other cases He poured forth His words spontaneously in a flood of reproaches and accusations. To this period belong the transparent parables of the great supper,[4] and of the rebel vinedressers who murder all the messengers of the lord of the vineyard, including his own son;[5] the subtleties concerning the 110th Psalm (p. 129); and the great pronouncement of doom upon the Pharisees for their hollow sanctimoniousness.[6] After such utterances the struggle could only end in blood. The Master was not content during these days, we may be quite sure, to storm and to lash; He also continually set forth anew the central thoughts in His doctrine of a God of love.[7] But on the whole He

[1] Mark xi. 27-33 = Matthew xxi. 23-27 = Luke xx. 1-8.

[2] Mark xii. 13-17 = Matthew xxii. 15-22 = Luke xx. 20-26.

[3] Mark xii. 18-27 = Matthew xxii. 23-33 = Luke xx. 27-40.

[4] Matthew xxii. 1-10 = Luke xiv. 15-24.

[5] Mark xii. 1-9 = Matthew xxi. 33-41 = Luke xx. 9-16; cp. Heb. i. 1 f.

[6] Matthew xxiii. 1-39 = Luke xx. 45-47, xi. 37-52, xiii. 34 f. = Mark xii. 38-40.

[7] We may have a reference to this in Mark xii. 28-34 = Matthew xxii. 34-40 = Luke x. 25-28.

seems to have caused no great commotion with His Gospel within the citadel of the Mosaic religion. His religion was too spiritual and simple to kindle at once a flame amongst the masses. Yet at first He must have regarded such a thing as possible.

CHAPTER XV

PRESENTIMENTS OF DEATH

1. *Growing Certainty of the End.*—Even in Galilee Jesus' joyful feeling of success and His confidence of victory had begun to receive a check. If the arrest of the Baptist had only distantly warned Him that possibly there were troubles ahead, and had made Him in a general way more cautious when He appeared in public, the tidings of the actual execution of His forerunner caused Him to shrink within himself and turn His steps towards the north, so as to be as far as possible out of reach of the arm of Antipas His sovereign.[1] From that time onwards Jesus, far-seeing and keen in perception as He was, was never wholly free from forebodings of disaster.[2] We may be sure that as occasion offered, He gave expression to these in the presence of His most trusted friends, though hardly in the terms reported, which so completely describe subsequent events that they can only have been framed later.[3] Yet even now the unconquerable optimism of His

[1] Mark ix. 13 = Matthew xvii. 12 f. ; cp. Luke xiii. 31.

[2] Mark ii. 20 = Matthew ix. 15 = Luke v. 35.

[3] Mark viii. 31 = Matthew xvi. 21 = Luke ix. 22 ; Mark ix. 31 = Matthew xvii. 22 = Luke ix. 44 ; Mark x. 32-34 = Matthew xx. 17-19 = Luke xviii. 31-34 ; Mark x. 38 f. = Matthew xx. 22 f. ; Luke xiii. 33.

glorious piety continued to assert itself. He was quite prepared to suffer,[1] but He was not yet convinced of the Divine necessity of the Passion. The stronger the conviction became that He was actually the Messiah, the larger grew the storm-cloud He had caught a glimpse of in the distance.

Not as if suffering was an integral element in the Jewish conception of Messiahship. On the contrary, Messiah and happiness were inseparably associated (against Matthew xvi. 21). The suffering Messiah was a creation of the Rabbis hundreds of years after Christ. The suffering servant of God in Isaiah liii. is the true people of Israel during the Babylonian exile in the sixth century B.C., no individual person,[2] least of all the Messiah, of whom the author of Isaiah xl.-lxvi. has nothing to say; the "righteous man," too, of the Book of the Wisdom of Solomon (chaps. iv. and v.), who soon must die, is also simply the individualised representative of all pious observers of the Law. Naturally, then, the disciples were simply unable to understand Jesus' presentiments of suffering.[3] Naturally, too, the shameful cross on which Jesus hung, long remained an object of the greatest offence to the Jews.[4] The conviction that He was the Messiah strengthened His worst forebodings simply because a conflict with the authorities more and more appeared to be unavoidable. The journey to Judæa and the events in Jerusalem revealed the full danger of His position. For

[1] Luke xvii. 33; cp. Matthew x. 39; xvi. 25; John xii. 25.

[2] Cp. the article "Servant of the Lord" in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*.

[3] Mark ix. 32=Luke ix. 45.

[4] 1 Cor. i. 23=Luke ii. 34 f., which contains a prophecy of the "mater dolorosa," and John i. 29, 36, where from the first Jesus is called "the Lamb of God," viewed in this light are seen to be very late.

this reason, and not wishing to sacrifice himself unnecessarily, Jesus left the walls of the holy city every evening to pass the night outside, perhaps choosing a different spot every night (Mark xi. 19). Luke xxi. 37 indicates the Mount of Olives for each day, Matthew xxi. 17 for but one, while Mark xiv. 3 = Matthew xxvi. 6 says that on one occasion He went to Bethany. Not until the last days spent at Jerusalem, however, could Jesus become assured of the violent end that lay before Him. His entry as Messiah into Jerusalem is not intelligible except on the supposition that He at that time expected a peaceful victory. Nay, even in the agony in Gethsemane, the possibility that the struggle would end without bloodshed would seem still to have been faintly glimmering before Him in the deepening darkness of the night.

How intelligible, because so human, is that yearning cry, "Father (Aram. Abba), all things are possible to thee. Let this cup pass from me! Nevertheless, not what I will, but what thou willest!" The ground is strewn with stones and thorns; the disciples whose want of steadfastness causes Him so much anxiety (Mark xiv. 38) have fallen asleep; in the background threatening storm-clouds hang over the blinded city. A single ray of light descends upon the head of Him who has been praying in the bitter anguish of death. Thus has the modern painter, H. Hofmann, depicted Jesus in this terrible hour.[1]

2. *The Celebration of the Passover Meal.*—If we seek

[1] If the story of the anointing of Jesus in Bethany is to be accepted as true, Matthew xxvi. 12=Mark xiv. 8=John xii. 7 would belong to this period. John xii. 27 f. and xviii. 11 preserve to us but a fragmentary reminiscence of the struggle in prayer in Gethsemane.

the strongest genuinely historical expression of Jesus' certainty of death, we shall find it in the words spoken by the Master at the Paschal meal.[1] The shortest record of them, that of Mark, is certainly the most ancient, since hardly anything would have been omitted from a formula that from an early date was regarded as sacred and repeated at every celebration. It is far more likely that additions would have been made. According to this narrative, it was the desire of Jesus, in accordance with Jewish custom, to celebrate the Paschal meal with His disciples as a father was wont to celebrate it with the members of his household. The festival was always held on the evening of the fourteenth day of the Jewish month Nisan (Mark xiv. 12, 14), or, according to Jewish custom, at the beginning of the 15th, the new day starting at twilight. According to the unanimous testimony of all the four Gospels, Jesus died on a Friday; the day of the Passover meal was therefore, on this occasion, a Thursday. The meal introduced the week of "unleavened bread." On this sacred festival, which was intended to commemorate the exodus of the children of Israel from the house of bondage in Egypt, every household slew and roasted a lamb. Before this was partaken of, a sauce was served in which the participators dipped unleavened bread and bitter herbs.[2] The bread was in the form of thin cakes which the father of the house did not cut, but broke. Three times in the course of the meal a cup of wine was handed round. At the

[1] Mark xiv. 22-25 = Matthew xxvi. 26-29 = 1 Cor. xi. 23-26 = Luke xxii. 17-20.

[2] At a later date these "green" herbs gave rise to the name "Green Thursday" and to the custom of eating vegetables as much as possible on this day.

close some of the hymns treasured in the Psalter were sung.

The Master had himself on this occasion chosen a place for the festival, the house of a friend in Jerusalem, and doubtless made all arrangements.[1] In accordance with ancient custom, the partakers reclined on small cushions round the table. It is no longer possible to decide whether Jesus had determined beforehand to give to the coming Passover feast the character of a solemn and impressive indication of His death, in which case Luke xxii. 15 f. would well represent His frame of mind, or whether He was suddenly inspired to act as He did by the intense impressiveness of the hour. But we may be sure that during the celebration the broken bread and the red wine in the last cup[2] reminded the partakers of the end which was so imminent, and that Jesus gave symbolical expression to this thought. The man who had seen so many wonderful parables, saw yet one more. At this festival He seemed to see His blood "shed for many" (Mark xiv. 24); He, the most hated man, by going to death, draws upon himself all the wrath of His enemies in such a manner that His followers are spared, and through them the cause which He had so much at heart is saved. They are the seed of the future. His self-sacrifice, therefore, is an offering of sacrifice that brings deliverance similar to that of Codrus, Curtius, Philotas, or Winkelried. This thought, that of the Paschal sacrifice, lay specially near at the Passover meal (cp. Exod. xii. 21-27). Jesus must on some occasion shortly before have

[1] Mark xiv. 12-16 = Matthew xxvi. 17-19 = Luke xxii. 7-13.

[2] Luke speaks intentionally of two cups in place of one, the third, that of the "prayer of thanksgiving," wishing to attach a deep symbolism to this number, two; the first cup is that of the Old, the second that of the New Testament.

expressed a very similar idea, that conveyed by the sublime saying about His ministry of service which we have taken as a motto for the whole of the concluding section of this book (p. 131). Here, too, Jesus desires to set free "the many," His disciples, from the unmerited pain of death that threatened them, by offering His own life as a ransom. The words spoken at the supper contain, it is true, an addition suggestive of further thoughts in the mind of the Master, an addition which may well be ascribed to the Master himself. He calls His blood "the blood of the covenant." He must have been thinking of Jeremiah's prophecy (xxxi. 31) of a new covenant with God. Knowing that He is about to die, He wishes to establish such a covenant and to seal it with His blood. It is at this point that the new religion once and for all disentangles itself from the old. It is clear, accordingly, that Jesus thinks of himself as the covenant sacrifice described in Exod. xxiv. 3-8; Gen. xv. 10, 17; and Jer. xxxiv. 18. At such a moment, of course, when He was filled with intense emotion, He did not imagine himself to be following out the precise details of the ritual, as modern expositors suppose, with its division of the sacrificial animal and sprinkling of the blood. All that He does is to contrast the new legislation with the old which was given on Mount Sinai. He wishes His disciples to be prepared for His death and to be reconciled to it. He would inspire them with strength and consolation to meet the hard days to come. He would link them closely with himself and with the cause of the kingdom of God. This He must have explained more fully in words that have not been preserved. The idea of the forgiveness of sins, therefore, does not come in here (cp. pp. 96-99). It is

introduced only in Matthew xxvi. 28, but this is a later insertion; if it were not, we could not understand its omission by Paul, when it suits his views so admirably. The command to repeat the celebration (1 Cor. xi. 24, 25, and Luke xxii. 20) is of still later date; its omission in Mark and Matthew would otherwise be impossible. When the ceremony received liturgical form such additions became easy and natural.

If we are properly to understand this intermingling of various ideas regarding covenant sacrifice and sacrifice of deliverance, we must not forget that already for some time before the end the thought of death had ever been present with Jesus. He struggled against it until He became certain that it was a Divine decree.

The chief idea indeed of the much later Gospel of John is that Jesus himself was slain as the Paschal lamb. "For as our passover is Christ slain" is again and again the refrain in this book, as in 1 Cor. v. 7. For this reason Jesus is said to have died, not on the 15th, but on the 14th Nisan.[1] For this reason He is nailed to the cross, not at 9 o'clock in the forenoon, but in the afternoon, and so at the time when, according to the law's requirement, the Passover lambs were killed. For this reason, as in the case of the Passover lamb, none of His bones might be broken.[2] In place of the supper, which is referred to only in John vi. 53-56 and 35, the Fourth Gospel substitutes a section describing a washing of the disciples' feet (xiii. 1-30); this section has no claim to be considered historical. The main idea in this description

[1] John xviii. 28; xix. 14, 31; cp. xiii. 1, 29.

[2] Cp. Mark xv. 25 with John xix. 14; Exod. xii. 46, Num. ix. 12, with John xix. 36.

is found only in Luke xxii. 27. The story is meant to symbolise the "service" of Jesus (cp. pp. 131 and 144 f.). In these circumstances, in deciding the time of Jesus' death, we ought not to be disposed to follow John rather than the three synoptists. We are tempted to do so because it seems easier to suppose that the proceedings against Jesus were all finished on an ordinary day, and not on a feast day, for such a day was observed with a strictness hardly less painful and severe than the observance of the Sabbath, and such proceedings would involve a violation of Jewish law. In circumstances, however, in which the criminal was regarded as specially infamous and a danger to the State, the Jewish authorities, in their zeal to vindicate the honour of God, would think themselves excused, we may be sure, for acting exceptionally, because they only made the charges on the feast-day, the heathen Romans carrying out the actual sentence (cp. p. 157). It is no doubt true that the feast-day really began at sunset on Thursday. The puzzle, therefore, is to know why the first three Evangelists should have made the feast-day the day of crucifixion, unless they did so in accordance with historical facts. Details in their accounts may of course be abandoned; additions would be made concerning Jewish things by ill-informed persons at a later date (cp. p. 158).

CHAPTER XVI

LIGHT IN THE NIGHT

If thoughts of death had been all that now occupied the mind of Jesus, He would have been in unrelieved despair. But down upon this darksome night God's everlasting stars gleamed brightly. What the heavenly Father decrees must be the best for His human child; this was the thought of the Son of man (p. 98). Thus, a bitter struggle past, Jesus has braced His will to yield obedience to the Divine decree.

This submission to the will of the Almighty gave Jesus strength to support the heavy load of suffering, to shed His blood for the truth. But it was not this submissiveness alone that gave Him the triumphant sense of victory. Had not His bold trust in God taken the form of belief in a Second Coming, His hope of the realisation of the kingdom of God and His Messianic aspirations would have been simply dashed to the ground. Certainty of death and assurance of the Second Coming grew together and reinforced each other. Jesus adopted the belief of His age, that God would send the Messiah from heaven. The reason for His departure was now clear: He must go in order to appear again in greater glory. Our knowledge of physical science may have taught us the impossibility

of such a thing, that it transcends the limits imposed on humanity, but this must not prevent us from seeing that Jesus himself believed in its possibility and made it the mainstay of His hope of victory. We cannot describe this belief as fanaticism. It was but the last link of a chain of beliefs full of the utmost simplicity, sober truth, and sublime greatness. The power of God and the magnificence of His cause were the points on which all Jesus' thoughts were centred. His own person did not seem so important; He found it difficult to adapt himself to fill His great rôle. This is not the kind of mistake that constitutes fanaticism. The fanatic actually sets out with some unattainable ideal. Like one intoxicated, he has wholly lost sight of the real and the possible. He sees but "one point burning red" (Harnack). In other spheres, too, the fanatic oversteps the bounds of what appears possible to his contemporaries. Jesus kept within the compass of the beliefs of His age. Our sources show beyond doubt that the idea of the Second Coming, the psychological explanation of which we have just seen, must be ascribed to Jesus himself. Even when we properly appreciate the fact that none of the sayings of Jesus about the future have come down to us without admixture of later figures and embellishments; even when we remove altogether[1] the "little apocalypse" of Matthew

[1] It is usual now to cut out at least Matthew xxiv. 6-8, 15-22, 29-31, 34-35 = Mark xiii. 7-9*a*, 14-20, 24-27, 30. In Luke the old separate source is used less closely. This description of the future, connected with Dan. xii. 11 and related to the Apocalypse of John, seems to have been suggested by the action of the Roman Emperor Caligula, who in the year 40 conceived the idea of setting up his own statue in the Temple as an object of worship (Matthew xxiv. 15 = Mark xiii. 14). Luke xxi. 20 represents the city as threatened by the army of the Romans.

xxiv. = Mark xiii. = Luke xxi., which prophesies that a figure of abomination would be set up in the Temple of Jerusalem (Matthew xxiv. 15 = Mark xiii. 14), and was doubtless composed by a Jew or Jewish Christian between the years 40 and 70 A.D.; even when we leave it an open question whether Jesus really foresaw, as of course was possible after the fashion of Jeremiah, the destruction of the holy city,[1] and even of the national sanctuary,[2]—even then there still remain a number of unimpeachable sayings about His Second Coming (*parusia*). In Matthew xvi. 27 f. (toned down in Mark viii. 38, ix. 1, and Luke ix. 26 f.) Jesus promises the generation then living that He will come in glory, though doubtless without the many varied details and definite statements about the time and hour which we now have (Mark xiii. 32 = Matthew xxiv. 36; Matthew xxvi. 29 = Mark xiv. 25 = Luke xxii. 18; Matthew xxvi. 64 = Mark xiv. 62 = Luke xxii. 69, and Matthew xix. 28 f. = Luke xxii. 29 f. = Matthew x. 23, xxiv. 27, 32 f. accord). These prophetic utterances of Jesus must have been taken over as part of the oldest tradition of the Church, for, the Second Coming having been so long delayed, the Evangelists at a later date must have been at pains to move forward the time of its advent.[3] To identify the belief in the resurrection with the hope of the Second Coming is to alter and distort the idea of the latter. The Messiah must return hither to earth. The kingdom must come into being here, more particularly in Zion. The resurrection, in the belief of that time, led

[1] Matthew xxiii. 37-39 = Luke xiii. 34 f.; xix. 41-44.

[2] Mark xiii. 2 = Matthew xxiv. 2 = Luke xxi. 6.

[3] *E.g.* Mark xiii. 7, Matthew xxiv. 6, Luke xvii. 22, Matthew xxiv. 48, xxv. 5, Mark xiii. 24, Luke xxi. 23-35 compared with Matthew xxiv. 29.

straight to heaven and to God;[1] for the doctrine that Jesus made a separate ascension into heaven, as distinguished from His resurrection, is much later. The Third Gospel refers both to at least the same day.[2] It is not until we come to the Acts of the Apostles that we find resurrection and ascension separated by a relatively long period of activity (Acts i. 3; xiii. 31). This then is the situation. Jesus, if He would be the Messiah, must overcome the thoughts of death by the hope that He would speedily return to His own and complete His work. This thought was His guiding light in the darkness.

[1] *E.g.* 1 Cor. xv. 4-12; Rom. viii. 34; Acts ii. 32-35; Heb. i. 3; x. 12.

[2] Luke xxiv. 13, 29, 33, 36, 50 f.

CHAPTER XVII

THE TRIAL OF JESUS

1. *Judas, the Traitor.*—We have already shown that the two hostile religious parties among the Jews, the Pharisees and Sadducees, were at one in their hatred of this Messiah who smote them with the sword of the Spirit and the scourge of His words. It is a common and world-wide experience that the bonds knit by a common hatred are stouter than the links of love. Like wolves round their prey, the emissaries of both parties had beset Jesus throughout the week of preparation for the feast. They had laid for Him many a trap and snare. But His royal spirit, armed with courage and caution, had steered its way through all difficulties. Here under the very eyes of the people none dared do violence to the Galilean, for fear of creating a disturbance or even a disaster in the city now swarming as it was with pilgrims.[1] Such a person as Jesus might only too easily seem to be aiming a blow, whether He actually intended it or not, at the Roman authorities. The violence and cruelty of Pilate

[1] Mark xiv. 1 f. = Luke xxii. 1 = Matthew xxvi. 2-5. According to the Fourth Gospel (vii. 1 ; xi. 54-57), the plot to do away with Jesus existed from the very first.

had heaped up fuel enough, and the flame of religious hatred smouldered under glowing ashes (pp. 35 f., 29). For this reason the popular leaders, acting in concert for once, determined to have resort to cunning on the 13th of Nisan. If at all possible, this Galilean fanatic must be rendered powerless for evil before the festival.

Fate now willed that one of Jesus' most trusted followers should become his Master's betrayer, Judas of Kerioth (pp. 89 ff.). By his crime against the purest and greatest of any who have ever appeared on the stage of history, this man has become for us the type of the basest kind of sinner; and the hire and kiss of Judas have become proverbial. In the Creed of the Church the traitor became, as it were, the living embodiment of Satan in the tragedy of the earthly sojourn of the Son of God.[1] For the historical inquirer, however, whose first and chief aim is to understand and depict his character, the renegade disciple is a perplexing figure. It is very probable that at heart Judas was never a thorough disciple; that, a Jew by birth, he joined Jesus' disciples only at a somewhat late stage; that Jesus' growing hostility to the religion of the fathers estranged him; and that, like the great majority of the people, he held with tenacity to the notion that the Messiah was bound to free his country from the rule of Rome. The hot-blooded realist in Judas came to be disillusionised by Jesus. Our sources give us no satisfactory account of the reasons for his apostasy;[2] for we cannot believe that he was impelled, as is mostly suggested (John xii. 4-6), by mere lust of money. The thirty pieces of silver, or more correctly shekels, which

[1] Cp. Luke xxii. 3; John vi. 70 f.

[2] Mark xiv. 10 f. = Matthew xxvi. 14-16 = Luke xxii. 3-6.

Matthew, and Matthew alone (xxvi. 15; xxvii. 3, 5 f.), tells us were the betrayer's reward, and which represent a sum of something under seventy shillings, would not in themselves, indeed, be so trifling a sum as to preclude us from imputing covetousness to Judas; for in point of fact the figure was reached at a later date, by inference from Zech. xi. 12—where, moreover, something quite different is really spoken of—and represents the ordinary price of a slave (Exod. xxi. 32). Only, if Judas was a covetous man, we must ask what it was that could have led him to join the poor wandering preacher, and what interest could the Master have taken in him? The only answer to both questions is to be found in his Messianic enthusiasm.

It would seem, indeed, as if the keen-sighted Nazarene had become conscious of a change in his manner during the last days; perhaps because Jesus' eyes had been made specially watchful by His anxiety for His own safety. He had retired every evening to the Mount of Olives, and did not always choose the same spot to pass the night in (p. 141). He had made His arrangements for the Passover quite secretly (Matthew xxvi. 17 f.). At a later date, it is true, narrators transformed this anxious foreboding of a coming betrayal (Mark xiv. 17-20) into an incredibly exact prediction of it,[1] which, had it been made, would inevitably have enabled the other disciples to fix upon Judas. That the traitor remained present with Jesus throughout the solemn hour of the Paschal supper is very probable, though it is Luke (xxii. 21) alone who distinctly says so. At any rate, it is certain that Judas had to dissemble down to the last moment, and also had to keep

[1] Cp. Matthew xxvi. 25, John xiii. 21-30, with Mark xiv. 17-20.

himself apprised of all the places where the Master proposed to spend the night; for the task he had undertaken was to lead the band of capturers, without any stir, to Jesus (Acts i. 16). His kiss also—the kiss of the scholar on the hand of the teacher—was rendered necessary by the darkness, as a sign by which others could recognise Him.[1] Jesus at first, doubtless, thought the intention was innocent (against Luke xxii. 48).

On the face of it, it is very possible that a man of Judas' passionate nature might, after he had helped to bring his Master to so disastrous an end, have become desperate with remorse (Matthew xxvii. 3-10). But the account in Matthew, as has already been said, is so told as to accord with Zech. xi. 12 f.[2] "The treasury" in the house of God, into which in accordance with Zech. xi. 13 the betrayer should have cast the reward of his crime, was changed, through a linguistic error, into "a potter"; this was then further explained as referring to a "potter's field," the pilgrims' burial-place (Matthew xxvii. 6-9). The Acts of the Apostles (i. 16-20) assigns to Judas a very different, though none the less horrible, form of death; and Papias, writing about the middle of the second century, crowns all by describing with repulsive minuteness the obesity of Judas and how he burst asunder.

2. *The Arrest of Jesus.*—The Paschal meal ended (pp. 141 ff.), Jesus had gone forth with all His disciples except Judas to the Mount of Olives.[3] On this occasion He had betaken himself to an enclosed olive plantation, where, it would seem from its name Gethsemane, there

[1] Mark xiv. 44 f. = Matthew xxvi. 48 f.
[2] Not with Jer. xxxii. 6-9, in spite of Matthew xxvii. 9.
[3] Mark xiv. 26 = Matthew xxvi. 30.

was an oil-press. Here Jesus prayed, as we have described on p. 141, against His cruel fate, until new power—according to the beautiful legend an angel (Luke xxii. 43)—came to Him from God. Then, about midnight, suddenly the worst fears of Jesus were at once realised. Led by Judas, a band of Temple guards and a rabble approaches.[1] The traitor marks out his Master (p. 154). After a slight effort at resistance, against the desire of Jesus,[2] the disciples, being only half-equipped against sudden attack, disappear.[3] Jesus is surrounded by His capturers, bound and led away.[4] Then, as quickly and quietly as possible, the band conduct their prisoner into the palace of Caiaphas, the high priest (p. 29), where the Synedrium, the highest tribunal of the Jews, or at least a third part of it (which had power to pronounce judgment in such cases as this), had already assembled.

Meantime Jesus' disciples had been scattered as dust in different directions. Their first halt, as we shall see later, was in their native Galilee. Only one of them had the courage to steal quietly after the band into the court of the high priest—Simon "the rock."[5] Thus he can hardly have been the man who smote the servant of the high

[1] It is only the Gospel of John (xviii. 3, 12), which is not so well informed on Jewish matters, that speaks of a Roman cohort (about 500 men). As a matter of fact, the Romans at first took no interest whatever in the affair.

[2] Matthew xxvi. 52 = Luke xxii. 51 = John xviii. 11.

[3] Various legends soon arose as to the ear of a servant of the high priest being cut off with a sword in the scuffle. Luke xxii. 50 f. already knows that it was the right ear and that Jesus at once healed it. John (xviii. 10) says the stroke was aimed by Peter, and that the servant's name was Malchus.

[4] Mark xiv. 43-50 = Matthew xxvi. 47-56 = Luke xxii. 47-53.

[5] Mark xiv. 54 = Matthew xxvi. 58 = Luke xxii. 54.

priest. But even this one disciple, Peter, to save his life, before the cock crowed in the morning had sworn with an oath before the servants that he had nothing to do with the Nazarene. The event is described very vividly in Mark (xiv. 66-72), though the repetition of the cock-crowing (against Matthew xxvi. 74 f. = Luke xxii. 60) seems forced. A prediction of this touching episode was at a later date put into the mouth of Jesus on the strength of Zech. xiii. 7.[1] Luke xxii. 31-34 is very late, the idea being to lay special stress on the leading part played by Peter at a later date. In all the accounts, Peter's weeping bitterly is intended to suggest that, even though he wavered, his love for his Master, that love which was soon to yield such splendid fruit, was still alive. Before Peter hurried from the courtyard he had, doubtless, heard the news of Jesus' condemnation.

3. *The Condemnation.*—Caiaphas and his associates would fain have established the guilt of the Galilean prisoner before the morning of the first day of the festival, the 15th of Nisan, had dawned on the capital. Their hatred had long decided the matter, but in the process some respect had to be paid to a judicial form. It must be left an open question whether in this case two courses of procedure were really followed, as prescribed for a death-sentence, one of them while it was still night, and the other at break of day (Mark xv. 1 = Matthew xxvii. 1). In any case Jesus was confronted with witnesses. If He was to be condemned their testimonies must agree. In the first instance, the question turned principally upon a saying of Jesus in which He was supposed to have promised the destruction of the Temple and the establishment of a

[1] Matthew xxvi. 30-35 = Mark xiv. 26-31.

new religion (cp. p. 119). The witnesses on this point not agreeing (Mark xiv. 59), Caiaphas, the president, called upon Jesus to defend himself, no doubt in the hope that something would escape from Him which could be used against Him. Jesus on His side might have been able to vindicate himself if He had explained His conception of His Messianic position, but He preferred to keep a dignified silence. He did not choose to have His convictions desecrated by being dragged before judges such as these. In order to bring the trial to a speedy conclusion, Caiaphas then put the question to Him whether He was the Messiah, and, adjuring Him by the living God, demanded His answer (Matthew xxvi. 63). Jesus boldly and face to face with death, with the oath-formula "Thou sayest it," declared himself Son of God. He was on the spot condemned to death for blasphemy (Matthew xxv. 65 f. = Mark xiv. 64); and, according to the Jewish view, such a judgment was no judicial murder, the practical proof of the culprit's Messiahship, the liberation of His people, being wanting. The death sentence, however, could only be carried out by the Roman authorities (John xviii. 31), Judæa having since 7 B.C. been formally brought under the Roman provincial administration (p. 25). As the question related to a pseudo-Messiah, their acquiescence seemed certain. Only, what the Jews anathematised as blasphemy against God they would have to describe to the Romans as rebellion against the Emperor (Luke xxiii. 2). Away with Him, then, to Pilate the procurator![1] was now, accordingly, the solution of the problem preferred by the chief priests and scribes, whose pious rage barely

[1] Matthew xxvii. 2 = Mark xv. 1 = Luke xxiii. 1; cp. pp. 29 and 151.

sufficed to compel their unanimity on such a point.[1] At this season Pilate, accompanied by a military force, had removed from the seaport town of Cæsarea, where he usually resided, to the old fortress of Herod in Jerusalem, which was fortified by three towers. It was necessary in these days of the great festival to have at hand a stronger force of Roman police than usual. Pilate inquired into Jesus' case at once, and soon perceived, even though the accused still made no attempt to defend himself,[2] that here he only had to deal with a harmless "king of the Jews," with a mere "religious fanatic" such as never as yet had caused the Romans any uneasiness (Mark xv. 10). Nevertheless, being anxious to make himself a little less unpopular than before, he sacrificed Jesus without scruple to the leaders of the people. It may be, too, that the attitude of the mob which had been incited against Jesus impressed him.

In our judgment on Pilate, indeed, we must not fail to remember that the Gospels, and most clearly those of later date, Luke (xxiii. 4, 13-16, 20) and John (xviii. 38; xix. 4, 6), reveal the desire to make his guilt appear as light as possible. For instance, the story of the presence in Jerusalem of Jesus' territorial sovereign, Herod Antipas (Luke xxiii. 6-16), is inserted simply in order that Pilate may be able to appeal to his judgment as to the harmlessness of the Nazarene. Again, though there is no historical evidence from any other source that it was customary to pardon a criminal at the Passover,[3] the blood-stained

[1] Mark xiv. 65 = Matthew xxvi. 67 f. = Luke xxii. 63 f.

[2] Mark xv. 5 = Matthew xxvii. 14 = Luke xxiii. 9.

[3] Mark xv. 6-15 = Matthew xxvii. 15-26 = Luke xxiii. 12-25 = John xviii. 39 f.

insurgent Barabbas is introduced as foil to Jesus. The procurator's wife has bad dreams by way of warning (Matthew xxvii. 19). Once more, Pilate finally washes his hands in innocency (Matthew xxvii. 24), though this custom prevailed only amongst the Jews. On the other hand, Jesus once having been condemned to a violent death, it was quite natural that the rough Roman soldiery should ill-treat Him, and after the manner of the Roman comedy adorn Him in mockery with a red military cloak and a crown of thorns.[1] Of course, in comparison with the one immovable fact of history, that Pilate handed over Jesus of Nazareth to be punished with the terrible death of crucifixion, all details in the story of the Passion are of subordinate importance.[2]

4. *The Crucifixion.*—The usual form of punishment for rebels, highway robbers, runaway slaves, and murderers, amongst the Romans, was to nail the culprit, quite naked, to a stake, above which a second beam was placed, mostly in the form of a T, or was fixed into it at two-thirds of its height. In this manner it was that Jesus was "reckoned among sinners" in the words of Isaiah (liii. 12). Indeed it was presumably this passage that first suggested the account of the two malefactors' crosses which stood on either side of Jesus.[3] The place of execution was a stony elevation near Jerusalem on the country road outside of the city walls. The configuration of the ground reminded people of a human skull.[4] This gave rise to the Aramaic

[1] Mark xv. 16-20 = Matthew xxvii. 27-31 = John xix. 2 f. (Micah iv. 14).

[2] Mark xv. 15 = Matthew xxvii. 26 = Luke xxiii. 25 = John xix. 16.

[3] Mark xv. 27 f., 32 = Matthew xxvii. 38, 44 = Luke xxiii. 32 f., 39 f.; cp. Gen. xl. 13 f.

[4] Mark xv. 22 = Matthew xxvii. 33 = Luke xxiii. 33 = John xix. 17.

name Golgotha. The most likely place at which to seek the site is on the south-west outside the town, though Church tradition points to the north-east within the walls. Hither Jesus, having been first scourged, a preliminary to execution (Mark xv. 15 = Matthew xxvii. 26), was brought without delay. Like others in similar circumstances, He had himself to bear the wood of the cross (John xix. 17). But, as the burden proved too much for Him, one who was passing by, an African Jew named Simon, who had journeyed to the feast at Jerusalem as a pilgrim from Cyrene, was made to come to His assistance. Two sons of this man, Alexander and Rufus (Mark xv. 21), are mentioned later as being amongst the adherents of the Crucified One (Rom. xvi. 13; 1 Tim. i. 20; 2 Tim. iv. 14). Of the disciples of Jesus, the women alone, who were not in danger, remained in Jerusalem (p. 93 f.). Deeply moved, they desired to watch from afar the cruel work of crucifixion (Mark xv. 40 f. = Matthew xxvii. 55 f.). But we may be sure that Jesus did not address to them such words as those of Luke xxiii. 27-31.

Arrived at Golgotha, the victim was stripped of His clothing. That the soldiers who took part in the crucifixion took this as their spoil is very probable. But the colours of the dramatic amplification of the scene, in which lots were drawn, are taken from Psalm xxii. 17-19.[1] At the head of Jesus was placed the statement of His crime: His claim to be the Messiah (pp. 124 ff.). Some one, moved by a humane impulse, offered Jesus the usual narcotic, the spiced wine used by soldiers, but He declined it.[2] He

[1] Mark xv. 24 = Matthew xxvii. 35 = Luke xxiii. 34*b*. The legend of the seamless coat is first found in John xix. 23.

[2] Mark xv. 23 = Matthew xxvii. 34. The later incident in Mark

would await the end with a clear mind. For, lacerated and bleeding as His body was, His heroic spirit was still unconquered. Then began those terrible protracted hours of the most excruciating agony which it is possible to imagine. If a medical specialist were to describe to us the feelings of an unfortunate sufferer, the whole weight of whose body hung, under a burning Eastern sun, upon nails which tore the delicate nerves of his hands and feet, we should find it well-nigh unbearable.[1] Jesus of Nazareth was nailed to the cross about nine o'clock in the morning of the 15th Nisan (Mark xv. 25); it was not until three o'clock in the afternoon that, with a great cry, the sufferer breathed His last (Mark xv. 37 = Matthew xxvii. 50). That He was pierced with a lance to make sure that He was dead we first find in John xix. 34-37. That the people at large, and even the priests as a body, should have been able to jeer in presence of such horrible realities[2] may well seem to us incredible. But to the rulers of the people compassion was hardly possible: was not all this done for the greater glory of God? This was the sole reason why the feast-day was not held to be desecrated by the crucifixion (Num. xv. 32-36).[3]

Later, the whole story of Jesus' tragic end was, as might be expected, embellished with all kinds of wonderful legends, with the idea of emphasising the greatness of the catastrophe. Amongst these additions we may reckon the three hours' darkness,[4] the rending of the Temple veil

xv. 36 = Matthew xxvii. 48 (cp. John xix. 28-30) seems also to be drawn from one of the Psalms (lxix. 22).

[1] Cp. the article "Cross" in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*.

[2] Mark xv. 29-32 = Matthew xxvii. 39-44 = Luke xxiii. 35-39.

[3] Cp. p. 146.

[4] Mark xv. 33 = Matthew xxvii. 45 = Luke xxiii. 44 f.

separating the holy of holies from the holy place,[1] the centurion's confession,[2] and much else (cp. pp. 49 ff.).

Certain sayings of Jesus in His last hours have been preserved. One of them bears upon it, unmistakably, the stamp of genuineness. It is given in Aramaic: "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" Mark (xv. 34) and Matthew (xxvii. 46) alone record it. Luke and John no longer ventured to believe that Jesus was for a moment overcome by a feeling of despair (p. 11). Luke gives, instead, three other sayings expressive of Jesus' love for His enemies (xxiii. 34; cp. Acts vii. 60) and assured faith in God (xxiii. 43 and 46). Lastly, the Fourth Gospel has none of these four; but in their place gives a conversation of Jesus with His mother and the disciple John (xix. 26 f.), which cannot in any sense be historical since neither of them was present. Jesus' complaint of thirst (xix. 28), which it goes on to record, has every likelihood; but this again seems to have been suggested by the 69th Psalm (p. 160, and p. 161 n.). The last saying (xix. 30), "It is finished," is as it were the Divine hero's note of triumph as He surveys His whole work. In view of the silence of our two eldest sources, it would seem that, although these six sayings, with the exception of that cry of despair which was wrung from Him in a moment of terrible torture, breathe the spirit of the Nazarene, they were not really spoken by Him as He writhed in the agony of death. We willingly think of the lives of great men as illuminated by one last great thought; the instinct would be peculiarly strong in the case of the greatest of the sons of men.

[1] Mark xv. 38 = Matthew xxvii. 51 = Luke xxiii. 45; cp. Heb. vi. 19, x. 19-22.

[2] Mark xv. 39 = Matthew xxvii. 54 = Luke xxiii. 47.

5. *The Interment.*—In most cases the Romans allowed the corpse of the crucified to remain on the cross that the passers-by, as they saw the greedy vultures at work, might be duly impressed. In the present instance Pilate was indulgent, and allowed one Joseph of Arimathea (Ramathaim), a secret adherent of Jesus, to take the body and inter it in one of the sepulchres hewn out of the rocks outside the city (Mark xv. 42-46 = Matthew xxvii. 57-60 = Luke xxiii. 50-52 = John xix. 38-41). Pilate, doubtless, had been convinced in his heart that Jesus was harmless (p. 158 f.). The women disciples seem to have learned of Joseph's kindly act. Perhaps they even rendered Jesus the last service of love (p. 93).[1] Joseph completed his task, and the earthly remains of the Master were laid to rest just as the lights of evening began to shine forth (Luke xxiii. 54).

[1] Cp. O. Holtzmann's *Life of Jesus*, p. 491.

CHAPTER XVIII

THE RESURRECTION FAITH

Thus ended the historical life of the Master of Nazareth. With the moment of His death on the cross of Golgotha the independent history of His Church began. But if we are to see how the one developed out of the other, we must show clearly how belief in Jesus' Resurrection arose, and what this belief meant for the Christian Church. For when Jesus fell into the hands of His enemies the little band of the faithful was dispersed, as sheep before the wolf (Mark xiv. 50 = Matthew xxvi. 56*b*). They fled to their native Galilee, where finally even Peter joined them (cp. Mark xvi. 7 = Matthew xxviii. 7*a*). Here at first they were filled with sorrow, disappointment, and the deepest pain. They fasted, we can well believe, as Jewish mourners were accustomed to do. All that remained to them was the old love for their Master and their yearning after Him. They could not believe that He was taken quite away from them, just as we ourselves for weeks cannot believe that one we have lost is gone for ever. They could not understand why their Master should have come to such a lamentable end. Jesus' sayings and promises about a Resurrection and Second Coming came

back to them again and again. And, pondering thus, they reached a state of the greatest exaltation. In the case of Peter, it would seem, this excitement and emotion from the beginning took special forms and was of the utmost intensity, the feeling of guilt weighing heavily upon his soul. He had foully disowned his beloved Master in the palace of Caiaphas (p. 155). Therefore Jesus' eyes seemed to be fastened upon him continually, full of reproach. From this vivid picture in the mental vision of a naïve human soul to a very life-like and realistic apparition of the risen Master was but a very little way. Science itself tells us that there are occasions on which the soul is in such a condition that, in accordance with fixed laws, it sees in palpable form what it desires to see and believes that it will see. It is, therefore, not impossible that Peter became convinced on the third day that Jesus had risen—the very day on which in his haste he reached Galilee. He then inspired the others with the same conviction,[1] they having been also, as we have said above, deeply stirred. In the case, therefore, of Jesus' various appearances to His disciples we have to do with *visions* merely, and, unless we choose to think of God as creating the image afresh on each occasion, simply with such visions as result from subjective experiences in the minds of those who see them. The visionary himself, of course, believes these inward experiences to be overpowering facts in the outside world, and nothing less. Nor are visions seen by a multitude of persons at once, as described by Paul in 1 Cor. xv., to be regarded as mere fables. History and psychological science vouch for the possibility of this also. Similar experiences have repeatedly happened—

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 5; cp. Luke xxiv. 34 and John xxi.

during the Crusades, in the life of the cloister, in the experience of pilgrims, and generally in times of religious exaltation. Consequently, after the crucifixion, Jesus was seen, heard, or handled by His followers, never objectively, but always subjectively only. In like manner, however near they may have felt Him to be to them in the holy supper, He never in a corporeal manner ate or drank with them. They saw Him with the eyes of love and worship, not with those of the body. Soon Isaiah liii. 1-12 and Psalm xxii. came to be generally regarded as explanations of what had befallen Jesus, and all the disciples' "hearts burned."[1] The account we have just given of what happened after Jesus' death is not the arbitrary invention of the mere shallow "rationalist," but, like the whole of the foregoing sketch, rests upon a calm and dispassionate examination of the New Testament sources. We have started with the oldest and therefore most reliable source, Paul the Apostle's account of the matter.[2] The Resurrection of Jesus, and therefore, in Paul's conception, Christianity as a whole, was questioned in the Corinthian Church.[3] Paul, therefore, took the greatest pains, in a considerable section of his Epistle, to set aside all such questionings. For this purpose he gathered together with the greatest care all the information he could find about the Resurrection, and drew up, so to speak, a catalogue of all the appearances of the Risen Master, placing them in their exact historical order. Thus we are not justified in thinking that everything that we meet with in any of the Gospels can be added to the

[1] Cp. Luke xxiv. 32.

[2] 1 Cor. xv. 5-8. On the historical value of Paul's Epistles see pp. viii., 4.

[3] 1 Cor. xv. 3, 17-19.

statements of Paul by way of supplement, or can be brought into connection with them by some harmonising method. Rather ought we to drop anything that does not harmonise with his very scrupulous and very early statements, regarding it as unhistorical or as a later embellishment of what really happened. In the first place, Paul, and, with Paul, history, had no information about the empty grave; in the second place, neither was aware that the women took such a prominent part in the events of Easter morning. Again, if the emptiness of the tomb, which at present is made by so many the foundation stone of their belief, had been a well-known fact in those days, not only would Paul have known of it, but he would have been certain to use the fact as evidence to be laid before the Corinthians.[1] But, apart from this consideration, the accounts of the Resurrection given by the Gospels, when they come to speak of the places, the persons, and the things that happened, reveal a whole chorus of contradictory voices and statements. In particular, Mark and Matthew still allow us to catch glimpses of the truth that the disciples, after their flight, saw their apparitions in Galilee, whereas Luke and John make Jerusalem alone the scene of the appearances.[2] If, however, the scene of the visions was on the shore of Gennesaret, it was neither possible, nor was there occasion, duly to examine the sepulchre in order to find out whether it was empty. For, in the first place, the believer had proof enough in the fact that he saw the Master, and in

[1] This, in spite of 1 Cor. xiv. 34 f., which an incredibly weak exegesis attempts to adduce here in explanation of Paul's silence on the subject of the tidings brought by the women.

[2] Mark xvi. 7 = Matthew xxviii. 7; Luke xxiv. 9-12; John xx. 1-19.

the second, in the Syrian climate no one could recognise the features of a dead person after the lapse of three days. Let it be once again repeated, that in all points in which the Gospels in their accounts of the Resurrection go beyond Paul, their statements must be regarded as later additions and embellishments.

As for the nature of those historically established appearances of Jesus, the words of Paul are once more our only guide. Paul assures us that the Risen Master had "been seen" or had "appeared" on six occasions. Of His having spoken, of His eating and drinking, or of His having been touched, he says not a word. Paul's account, in fact, represents his own experience on the way to Damascus to have been of quite the same nature as those other appearances which disciples of Jesus Christ individually and in the mass had experienced after his departure. The vision he had himself received, therefore, was in his view no less real than the experiences of the original Apostles. And this shows us clearly that in all these cases alike we are dealing simply with experiences within the soul. For, according to Acts xxvi. 12-18 and xxii. 6-9 as against ix. 3-7, the companions of Paul did not perceive anything of the things which their leader was experiencing. All that they saw was the flash of lightning in the meridian sky, which caused such emotion in Paul, as a similar flash did later in the case of Luther.[1] Thus, when the matter is carefully examined, everything points to the conclusion that the phenomena in question

[1] A critical comparison of Acts ix. 3-7, xxii. 6-9, xxvi. 12-18, shows that the account of Paul's conversion in xxvi. 12-18 is the earliest and most authoritative. Even here, however, the Apostle's inward feeling may have been represented dramatically, in so far as the statements go beyond Gal. i. 11 f.; 1 Cor. ix. 1; 2 Cor. xii. 1-4; iv. 6.

were of the nature of visions; and modern psychology shows that these have a natural explanation and are in no sense miraculous.

As conclusively shown above, the first appearances of the Risen One were in Galilee. It was here that fear was first overcome by love. By degrees the disciples assembled once more in Jerusalem in order to visit again the spot where their Master and Messiah had shed His blood. Not three days, but weeks, had passed.[1] What now began to speak to them of the Risen One were not angels, but all the old landmarks, the burial-place, the houses of friends, the road to the Mount of Olives,[2] and they now sang the praise of the God who works the great miracle of resuscitation. They justified their faith, too, against gainsayers who denied the Resurrection. It was then that they conceived the idea of the empty grave, guarded against violation by a door of stone, a seal, and a military guard (Matthew xxvii. 64-66). We may be sure that no one could have troubled about the real sepulchre of Jesus at a time when it was possible to observe what really happened. This belief in the Master's Resurrection continued to be the foundation stone of the Church, even after men's minds had become calmer, and when they were convinced that as a matter of fact Jesus had left the earth in an Ascension.[3]

But, in view of the historical fact as now stated, it will be asked again and again, Is not, then, the whole Church

[1] The three days (from Friday to Sunday) are due to the Jewish notion that the soul of the departed hovered about its old abode for three days.

[2] Cp. especially Luke xxiv. 13-49 and John xx. 1-29.

[3] Cp. the article "Resurrection Narratives" in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*.

founded upon a delusion, and were not the first Christians visionaries and fanatics? This could be said only if we were no longer able to say that the imperishable part of man's nature returns transfigured to God, or that there is any such thing as immortality. But if immortality is a fact, proved again and again by spiritual phenomena in the world, the vision was simply the historically conditioned form given to the conviction, reached at the time, that the noblest part of Jesus, His spirit, was not buried in the grave or subject to decay (Luke xxiv. 5; Matthew xviii. 20). And what man was ever in so pre-eminent a degree worthy of a home with God? Thus by the will of God despair was changed into hope, fear into strength, the wail of defeat into the shout of triumph; and the spirit of the Nazarene conquered the world.

CHAPTER XIX

SUMMARY

Any one who has read the preceding pages, fully encased in the defensive armour of traditional belief, without even for a moment having been perplexed by the problems of what is humanly and historically credible, will only feel displeasure at our attempt, as at any other attempt, to rediscover the Jesus of history. He will be unable to understand that for us too, within the limits of the human, there remains a great religious and ethical hero, whose purity is unrivalled, and before whose spiritual majesty we bow the knee in adoring love. His indignant judgment will simply be "Mere humanism!" We are sorry to cause such displeasure. As Christians, who ought to obey the law of love, it is painful to do so. At the same time it may be indispensably necessary; it is only by soul-struggles that an imagined piety can be made into something real, a dead religion into something living, and the war for consecrated formulas brought to an end. Life is greater than formula.

It is some consolation to reflect that the number of those who, penetrated by the modern feeling for science

and history, long for the purging of tradition, and hold fast to a belief that God's world is ruled in accordance with inviolable laws, becomes daily greater. Woe to the Church that would deceive itself any longer! Let it beware lest the masses desert its lofty piles, and be content to find instruction and edification in the lecture-room, the art-galleries, and the museum! There is urgent need that we should ever anew bring home to the minds of men, with all urgency and fearlessness, those primitive forms of Christianity which are so simple and yet so sublime. Scholars, indeed, have long been able to breathe freely, but the layman still sighs, gropes in darkness, or despairs. Those, too, who are in charge of schools and colleges, especially of schools for the people, are far from being allowed to teach any new religious truths. Instead of preparing children's minds for a historical understanding of Christianity, they are often obliged to fill them with the lessons of an antiquated system learned by rote.

How incomparably far apart from the Christ of dogma is the Jesus of history! With what directness even now are we stirred and stimulated by the personality and the thinking of Jesus. He is, we feel, flesh of our flesh, bone of our bone. At all points we get into touch with Him. By the historical conception of Him the seeming contradictions in tradition, which are so many, are made to vanish. It relieves Him of the tawdry adornment of a mere worker of miracles; it relieves Him of the socialism which takes extravagant delight in poverty. It shows Him to us influenced by the formative elements of His time. We see clearly the limitations of His outlook. We are carried back into the vanishing world in which He lived. And

yet we still see with equal clearness how the common feeling of humanity prevailed in Him, how profound was His teaching, how divinely exalted His nature. Since He combined so magnificently demands and fulfilment, word and deed, He sets us a brilliant example as we journey along the rough up-hill road of life. In these days, it is true, we often turn to Him for answers to all kinds of questions about family, marriage, labour, duty of citizens, property, Society, the State, war, art, and what not—questions with which we find He hardly dealt at all, or, if He did so, under quite peculiar circumstances, under the influence of His belief that the end of the world was approaching, and of His persuasion of the unique character of His own mission. But it is foolish to talk of gaps in Jesus' teaching, when the Spirit of Jesus supplies answers to all the new questions of a new age. What we at present need to do is to associate with Him the ideal figure of a son of man well-pleasing to God, in a modern form; and if we do this we shall never weary of finding new names and terms wherewith to express His great significance for all mankind.

The three great early-Christian titles, Messiah, Son of God, and Son of man, are hardly fitted now, without further explanation, to express what is essential in our conception of His person. There enters into them "either the distorted old or the distorted new." We need, above all, simpler designations. The name "Master" (Magister, Rabbi) is one that now appeals to us very specially, for it expresses what is for all of us—we are all religious at heart—the one essential thing. "O Lehrer, dem kein andrer gleich,"[1] says the hymn. This reminds us of Jesus'

[1] "O teacher, without peer."

uniqueness, which is not to be confounded with singularity, but denotes unequalled excellence in goodness and greatness. The title "Lord," too, comes very near our inmost hearts, Jesus being our "spiritual guide." He constrains us, not, of course, physically, but psychically; He overpowers us inwardly by His spirituality, by His purity, truthfulness, and love. This is the "Holy Spirit" within Him. He kindled a fire in humanity, which spread. We may also speak of Him as the "Redeemer." Not in the sense that His death was a propitiatory sacrifice, without which the God of love would not have been able to forgive us our sins. Not in this sense; yet it was indeed His special work to redeem by guiding us from the letter to the spirit, from the feeling of a slave to the love of a child, from self-seeking to brotherly love, from the dominion of the visible to that of the invisible, and His death showed that He was ready and determined to offer, in order to procure these benefits, not His labour only, but also His life. If we wish, however, to use a term that shall gather up all His services and satisfy us by its old-world ring, we can call Him, as the old Saxon poet of "Heljand" does, the Saviour, in other words the saving one, He who brings salvation or happiness.

The supreme fact of all about our worship is that it rests upon a firm historical foundation. For, as was explained at the outset, we have not sought to find in our sources a figure in harmony with our personal preferences; we have set to work in a methodical and sober manner. No doubt there will be differences of opinion still as to this or that detail, the authenticity of this or that saying. This is only to be expected. But let it be noted that we ourselves habitually expressed ourselves with caution and

reserve. Still, the general impression conveyed by our picture of the religious genius depicted will not have been impaired. And it is only by following this real Jesus of history that men will reach the Christ who lives to-day.

INDEX

THE END

Printed by R. & R. Clark, Limited, *Edinburgh.*